NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Royal Oak, Michigan | November 18, 1940 | Subscription: Three Dollars Per Year | 10c

U.S. LEADERS PLEAD FOR NATIONAL UNITY

Can We Keep War Out of America Now?

(See Page 5)

All of Europe Facing Winter of Starvation

(Story on Page 12)

Film Stars Took Sides in Presidential Campaign

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ STALIN, THE ENIGMA ★ PRESS VIEWS ON THE ELECTION

Dinner Chat

National Unity

SOCIAL JUSTICE gives place to none in our enthusiasm for national unity to heal the bitterness of partisan strife in the late campaign.

In fact, SOCIAL JUSTICE was campaigning for national unity as long ago as the *National Union for Social Justice* back in 1936.

* * *

Community bonfires at which left-over campaign literature was burned, and "union now" oratory delivered; and a "Unity of America" rally at Carnegie Hall in New York City, followed the election.

While these affairs were being hailed as symbols of pacification, they were also under attack as renewed first steps to drag America into war.

It develops that the big Carnegie Hall rally was under auspices of a so-called "Council for Democracy" and was backed by prominent pro-British personages.

Similarly, Mr. William Allen White's Committee to Defend America by Helping the British directed its 717 units to sponsor community "unity" rallies.

A unity movement arranged and directed by war makers, and union-with-Britain enthusiasts, is as questionable as if it were directed exclusively by New Dealers.

It ought to be clear, we think, that the "unity" that is being so enthusiastically talked about is *unity among Americans* and not unity with Great Britain.

There seems to be a not-to-subtle scheme on foot to capitalize on the confusion and misuse this word "unity," not unlike our already official misuse of the word "obsolete."

The issue of war aid to Great Britain was not in dispute in the recent campaign — both candidates were for it.

There would seem to be no justification, therefore, for pro-British enthusiasts seizing upon the election of Mr. Roosevelt to make the victory in some special way theirs, or to accept the "mandate" of the voters as some sort of "go" signal for renewed efforts to unite this country with the British Motherland.

If that was the election issue, a lot of us—even those of us who may have voted for Mr. Roosevelt —have been fooled.

And, truly, *it is much later than we think.*

Strength in Unity

"THE VERY composition of America tends to invite dissensions," observes the *Cleveland Plain Dealer.* "We are a people composed of racial strains gathered from every part of the Old World. It is not surprising if European jealousies, products of centuries of warfare, dilutes the Americanism of some who have come to these shores for the better opportunities they offer.

"But, regardless of how many years ago our forebears followed the setting sun across the sea, we are all here for the common purpose of bettering ourselves. And the only way we can enjoy the guaranties of freedom—which are the America we love—is to make this country greater, fairer, more lovely as the years go by. Certainly, Americans cannot be happy and prosperous unless America is.

"Part of the creed of every American in these days of threats from the outside should be a recognition of the vital importance of this national unity. Part of his pledge of allegiance ought to be a promise to do everything in his power to encourage such unity."

Anonymous

ANONYMOUS letters to the editor do not always contain abuse.

Very frequently, they contain practical and constructive suggestions of real value.

While we are prompt to take advantage of the proffered advice and are truly grateful for it, we are barred from communicating with the writer because of this quirk of anonymity.

For the same reason we cannot publish many excellent letters submitted for the *Letters Page.*

Some weeks ago SOCIAL JUSTICE adopted a uniform policy of using initials instead of names on all published Letters.

We must, however, have the full name and address of every writer. While these are not published, they are carefully filed, and letters addressed to the writers will be forwarded by the editorial office. In no case will the name and address of the writers be given out to inquirers.

This, as you will be aware, is extra work for the editorial secretaries but we are willing to perform it as a service to our readers.

Ever since SOCIAL JUSTICE was published, a set of "racketeers," and promoters of special interests, have promptly circularized anybody whose name appeared on the *Letters Page* of this magazine. This, we figured, was understandable.

But more recently, we found that earnest Americans, writing to express their honest views, were sometimes made the recipients of abuse by anonymous poison pen writers.

To protect our contributors from this annoyance, we are now using only initials.

But we cannot accept for publication letters which come to us with initials only. It is not only our rule, but publishing practice that the editorial office have the writer's name and address as a guarantee of the writer's good faith, and also so that letters addressed to the writer can be forwarded to him.

This editorial note will answer a number of inquiries at hand, as well as to re-state the policy of this magazine in respect to anonymous letters.

Is this clear?

Also, isn't it fair?

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.
Just living annual wage.
Nationalization of important public resources.
Private ownership of all other property.
Control of private property for public good.
Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.
Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.
Cost of living maintained on an even keel.
Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.
Labor's right to organize.
Recall of non-productive bonds.
Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.
Simplification of Government and lower taxes.
Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.
Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE, National Weekly. Copyrighted 1940 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $2.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed, all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.
SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.
Vol. 6 November 18, 1940 No. 21

Pete Thanks You for the Subscriptions

HELLO, FOLKS:

Well, if it isn't time f'r annuther visut with all my good frien's! Seems good, too. Y'know, if I didn't have you folks t' talk to these days, I don't know what I'd do. Really, I don't. Since this reconstrukshun progrum got started at our house, I've been somethin' like a man without a country'd be like. My one 'n only konsolashun is that it's gonna be over soon, 'cause th' weddin' annaversry shindig's due soon 'n they just *hafta* get it all in order.

I don't know much 'bout what caused all th' delay, but from what I've seen 'n herd it seems that when they'd get supplies th' carpenters'd walk off 'n not show up f'r a cuppla days, 'r th' plasterer 'r painter'd hie himself off 'n show up when he felt like it. They say it's like that all over.

What's th' big idee? Looks t' me like th' tradesmen have th' poor builder right at their mercy, 'n it doesn't seem right t' me.

Maybe I'm steppin' outta my place when I say it, but it strikes me that th' tradesmen'd be kinda outta luck if peepul'd just be satusfied with their buildin's 'n homes 'n not bother havin' 'em fixt up 'n let *them* wait around a littul. It wouldn't set so well with 'em, I'll bet. Th' fuss'd be on then!

* * *

Poor Mother Coughlin's been sufferin' from an awful cold th' past few days. Guess there's a lotta 'em goin' th' rounds now. Seems like ev'ryone up at th' offuce is sneezin' 'n coffen 'n blowin' 'n wheezin'. It's just in th' air.

But poor Daddy Schwartz's wors off'n all th' rest. He's got somethin' th' matter with his eyes 'n hasta go 'round with dark glasses on. Dear me, I'm glad I'm helthy. It must be awful havin' t' go about lookin' at th' world through dark-colered glasses instead uv rose-colered ones. But it isn't dampenin' his spiruts enny—he is a kronic optamist — even th' election returns couldn't change his outlook on life 'n the futchur uv America.

That's wonderful, isn't it?

* * *

Well, t' tell y' th' truth, folks, I'm feelin' slightly more optamistik myself these last few days, 'cause I found out that y' came through —just's I thought y' would—'n th' ol' subskripshun figgers jumpt up like's if y' were hittin' th' bull's eye ev'ry time, so t' speak. That's th' spirut I like t' see—keep it up, now.

I'll have lots t' be thankful f'r on Thanksgivin' Day—which, I've been told, comes a littul erly this year.

Some call it "Franksgivin'," but I don't know why, do you? All I say is, Thanksgivin' 'r Franksgivin', I hope th' folks save a good helthy-lookin' turkey leg f'r me. I hope Pal comes down t' selebrate with me, too. I'm gettin' kinda lonesum — I haven't seen him f'r quite a long while now.

Well, I guess I'll be on my way now. I haven't enny more t' say, 'xceptin' thank you once again f'r y'r swell kooperashun. I shure do 'preshiate that.

Be good, now, 'n I'll be seein' y' soon.

—Pete

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date_____

Name_____

Address_____ City_____

State_____ Subscription rate $3 a year. Renewal ☐ New ☐

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

Comment

Post-Mortems and Hopes

By A Popular majority, approximately 4½-million votes, Franklin D. Roosevelt won the presidential election.

And, to the chagrin of the Republicans, the New Dealers increased their power both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

While this does not represent a "mandate" from all the people of the United States of America, nevertheless this smashing victory for the third-term tradition-smasher is a green light signalling him to proceed straight ahead with both his domestic and foreign policies — domestic policies which are acid to the rich and oil to the poor; and foreign policies which promise peace at home and aid to Great Britain abroad.

While millions of votes were cast *for* Mr. Roosevelt, millions more were cast *against* the namby-pamby Republican platform.

Mr. Willkie promised jobs and prosperity for the laboring class, but failed to specify how either jobs or prosperity could be created other than to indicate a revival of rugged industrial individualism plus unionism, and industrial aid for warring Britain.

In this respect he exhibited a misunderstanding of the pressing problems of the day — problems related to a living annual wage based on what a man produces and not for the number of hours he works.

While Mr. Willkie condemned WPA-ism and doles with faint approval, he likewise exhibited a lack of understanding of the basic economic-financial problem.

Not once did he raise the issue associated with a lack of purchasing power in the purses of the teeming millions. It is true that there are billions of dollars idle in the banks. These dollars are not available to, approximately, 90 per cent of our population who get their dollars only through the process of gainful employment.

And it is the business of the Government, through its constitutional right to coin and regulate the value of money, to see that purchasing power is available to the citizenry in a nation where there is a plentitude of work to be done; in a nation where there is a plentitude of hands to do the work.

* * *

America was looking for more than a platitudinous pleader for harmony.

America was looking for more than a virtuous aspirant to the White House — one who would take issue with the incumbent's policies; not one who played the same tune.

And America looked in vain — particularly that portion of America which dwells in the large cities.

We do not wish to convey the impression that, in our judgment, the majority of citizens voted *against* Mr. Willkie. On the contrary, those who marked the Democrat ballot voted, for the most part, *for* Mr. Roosevelt — probably 60 per cent of them.

Under his Administration more relief was brought to the farmers than had been accorded them by Republicans.

Under his Administration more consideration was given to the laborers than was extended to them under Republican Administration.

Many economists and analysts believe that these agricultural and industrial reforms were and are chocolate-covered poisoned pills which, eventually, will paralyze both agriculture and labor. But, at this date, the laborers do not share that view because they are yet enjoying the chocolate.

Independent of what time will tell, we who believe in majority rule must face realities and consider that it was better, in the providential sense, that events happened as they have happened.

Social Justice records the above statement although it advocated the election of Mr. Willkie chiefly for the reason that we judged him more capable of keeping us out of the present European war than was his victorious opponent.

At no time were we convinced that he would establish as his policy the principles of Christian social justice.

* * *

In the past — since the 1935-36 presidential campaign — Social Justice has been opposed — violently opposed, at times — to many of Mr. Roosevelt's policies and practices.

These we need not rehearse at the moment, as the litany of them is well known to our readers.

Nor do we retract in substance what we have printed in this respect.

Nevertheless, a basic principle of our democratic traditions has been abandoned in the re-election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt for a third term — abandoned to such an extent that our definition of American democracy must be altered, henceforth, to embrace the idea of indispensability.

The theory is now acceptable — and will continue to be accepted until positively declared as unconstitutional — that there is nothing heterodox in maintaining a permanent President in the White House.

Under such circumstances, a new day has dawned.

Thus, Social Justice is content to file the past record of Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal in its archives — and leave it there.

Social Justice, without relinquishing one iota of its principles or program, is willing now to open a new file — and herewith does so — in the spirit of unity and class co-operation.

* * *

As a preface to our file, we incorporate all the public statements made by Mr. Roosevelt during the recent presidential campaign — particularly those statements relative to keeping America at peace.

We recognize that only a united nation whose prosperity depends chiefly upon its domestic serenity can insure this pledge of peace.

As our file grows, we adamantly reserve the right to applaud or condemn, to praise or to criticize, to support or to oppose, those vital principles and practices identified with the well-being or ill-being of America.

While, also, we reserve the right to be concrete in our writings, thereby mentioning names specifically, let it be understood that we are supporters of Christian social justice.

Although it is our prayer that we will never be guilty of any racial or religious intolerance, nevertheless one cannot expect us to sit idly by, refusing to comment, if and when others are guilty of racial or religious intolerance.

In this America we should live side by side, united on the principles of freedom of speech and freedom of worship.

In this America — be we Jew, Protestant or Catholic; be we Democrat, Republican or Socialist — we should work together as laborers, farmers, industrialists, financiers, merchants, professionals, artists and servants, to produce and distribute the necessaries and conveniences which this country is capable of producing and distributing.

Therefore, there should be class co-operation, independent, if necessary, of what religion a man professes; and independent of the race or nationality from which he originates.

The contest between the Old Deal and the New Deal has been waged.

The Old Deal lost because it refused to streamline itself to meet the traffic conditions of modern society.

The New Deal won, not because it is the best new deal, but because, in the consideration of the majority of Americans, it was a better new deal than the one offered by Mr. Willkie.

Our hopes, obviously, lie in the future. They are hopes for peace at home and abroad; hopes for the solution of the problem of distribution; hopes that a kind Christ will still the angry waters of class hatred; hopes for a brighter and happier New Deal in days to come — brighter and happier than the New Deal which we consider terminated on November 5, 1940.

Index to Comment

Dinner Chat: National Unity; Strength in Unity; Anonymous Letters ..... Page 2
Post-Mortems and Hopes ..... Page 3
'Union Now'—Aid for Britain ..... Page 4
And Now, Our Guns; No War for United States? ..... Page 5
Editorials: British Jubilant; 20,000 Draft Names Lost; —and Fish ..... Page 6
Crackpots; Marcantonio; John Lewis, Hail and Farewell ..... Page 7
Father Coughlin versus Katharine Fitzgerald ..... Page 8
Why Spain Is on the Blacklist; $60-Billion Debt; Tomorrow's Reckoning ..... Page 9
Stalin, the Enigma; Soviet Makes Deals With Both Sides; Beware Russia's Help ..... Page 10
Swords vs. Plowshares; Empty Schools — Jobless Teachers ..... Page 11
Hollywood's Campaign ..... Page 12
Press Views on the Election ..... Pages 13, 14, 15
Writer in England Attends Church; Oil Is 'Dynamite' ..... Page 19
National Unity ..... Page 20

Comment

'Union Now'— Aid for Britain

THE WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE committee has done much to circulate the political heresy of *"Union Now."*

Specifically, this heresy will terminate, if its premises are accepted, in the political union of Great Britain and the United States of America.

For many years, a social union has existed between these Governments.

For many years, an economic union has existed between these Governments.

For many years, Americans have labored under the opinion that their ancestors fought the War of Independence to sever a political union between these two Governments.

According to those who apparently mold the mind of modern America, George Washington and his compatriots were in error — or at best, children of a "horse-and-buggy era."

The Roosevelt Administration favors the idea of *"Union Now"* and aid for Great Britain.

Mr. Willkie, who owes his defeat chiefly to the reason that he did not take sharper issue with Mr. Roosevelt's policies, also appears to favor the idea of *"Union Now"* and aid for Great Britain.

SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine does not accept the theory that *"Union Now"* and aid for Great Britain represent the best policy for the United States of America.

And why?

* * *

Granted that Germany and her totalitarian allies are unjust aggressors, the British Empire was and is an unjust aggressor, having seized the vast territory of India with its hundreds of millions of subjects and its hundreds of billions of wealth.

Mother India is just as anxious to gain her independence from Britain as is Poland from Germany and Russia; as is Czechoslovakia from Germany; as is Ethiopia from Italy; as are Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland from Russia.

In the above paragraphs the mention of the word, "England," was not made — and this, definitely, because England and Great Britain are not synonymous words, nor do they convey synonymous concepts.

Britain is an empire.

England is a nation.

There is no such thing as a "British citizen."

There is such a thing as an English citizen.

While there is such a thing as a British *subject*, let us recollect that the word, "Britain," itself, stands for an imperial concept identified with the thought that a small group of men hitherto operated and controlled two political parties in England, for the purpose of imposing a specific economic system of exploitation upon the peoples of the various nationalities subject to the British flag; and for the profit, not of the English nationals, not of the Canadian nationals, not of the Australian nationals, not of the South African nationals, not of the Indian nationals — but for the profit of a small group of internationalists who either owned or controlled the financial and commercial agencies upon which the Empire was operated.

Therefore, the idea behind the words, *"Union Now"* and aid for Great Britain is, to our mind, unAmerican and unsound.

With the acceptance of such an idea there is the implication that we will accept the consequences of imperialism.

Already there is sufficient evidence to indicate that the spirit of Empire, now clamoring for recognition in our midst, is seducing us to reach out towards Asia.

It will be disastrous if we succumb to that temptation — disastrous if we attempt to dominate, under the specious pretext of protection, China, India, or Asiatic Holland.

To our mind, the philosophy of totalitarianism is unsound.

* * *

Preferable to either of the above, the philosophy of nationalism is soundest for America — for both Americas — if the Commonwealth and Republics of these two continents can arrive at favorable understandings to co-operate with one another, free from both totalitarian and imperialistic errors.

It appears to us that those who advocate the idea of *"Union Now"* and aid for Great Britain are those who see nothing but failure in the Great Experiment originated by George Washington — particularly when, uppermost in their ideas, is the thought of protecting and extending the errors of imperialism rather than of bringing aid and comfort to the poor civilians of England.

Let Americans well understand that the English citizens long since have been exploited.

Let Americans understand that the tax burdens borne by English citizens are more than double the tax burdens borne by the citizens of this country.

Let Americans understand that there are fewer home owners *per capita* in England than there are in this country.

Let Americans understand that imperialism, which concerned itself with exploiting foreign lands, did not concern itself with ameliorating the conditions of the poor at home.

Many Americans do not appreciate the difference between Britain and England.

That differentiation was omitted either purposely or accidentally from our text books in school and library.

Consequently, inaccurate usage of these two words is common even in circles which are supposed to enjoy a modicum of culture.

Housing Act of 1859

(Gene Lindberg in the Denver Post)

THERE wasn't any architect. No banker made a loan
To solve their housing problem. They were strictly on their own.
They didn't sign a mortgage and they didn't buy a lot;
Just stopped the covered wagon at a likely looking spot.
No lumber yards were running. They cut timber in the hills
And hewed it into beams and joists and doors and window sills.
They had to hand-saw every plank and quarry every stone,
But finally they got it done — a home to call their own.
No mansion, but a sturdy house their own strong hands had made,
It stood on fertile acres that had never been surveyed.
No warranty. No abstract fee. No red tape legal fuss.
They just came out and built the west and left all that to us.

Allowing for the mis-usage of the word, "England," — a mis-usage which the editor of *The Irish World* is not guilty of — we append an editorial from that estimable journal (November 9) which reads as follows:

"A committee of Catholics, in presenting the view that the safety of religion in the United States can best be met by aid to England, use the qualifying clause, 'whatever some of us may feel concerning the actions of England in the past.' They seem to have found difficulty in adding: 'whatever England may be doing in the present.'

"For even those of them who profess no concern for what has happened in the past can hardly fail to be aware, unless they have closed their eyes and ears, that the Catholics in that part of Ireland which England still controls are having a very hard time of it indeed.

"To go no farther than the affair of the moment, they are told that they 'cannot be trusted with lethal weapons' with which to defend their own island in case of attack, although all the rest of Ireland is making every preparation possible to repel such an attack.

"Here in America, and even in England, when the call for preparation for defense is made there is no difference made between Catholics and others. In the six counties that constitute the English bridgehead in Ireland there is that distinction.

"That is one of the things General Gough and his associates have been so bitterly complaining about, for they see that because Irish Catholics in that part of Ireland are not permitted to help defend their own homes battalions of conscripts from England must be sent to take on the task.

"How anomalous it is to proclaim the necessity of sending aid to England in the name of the Catholic religion in the United States, when one realizes that part of the aid would go to keep the Catholics of Northern Ireland in the state of subjection which is now their lot.

"How ridiculous it is to rally to the defense of religion, here, where we are quite capable of keeping it alive against all detested ideologies, and inferentially assent to the persecution of Catholics who are much nearer to the totalitarian scene.

"Can one imagine the English conscripts now in Ireland being withdrawn for service elsewhere, and American regiments being sent to hold the Catholics of Northern Ireland under the yoke? How would that suit, for example, with one member of the committee who once commanded the 69th New York?

"None of us want to see the Irish destroyed, Catholic or non-Catholic. Most of us know that great numbers of Irish, in England, are sharing the desperate risks of the hour. But what no one can understand, not even the members of this American Catholic committee, is why it suits England to have Irishmen subject to German methods of suppression in one country and to English methods of suppression in another.

"If they want testimony on the subject, they can get it in plenty from the Catholic hierarchy in Northern Ireland. The Church is on no bed of roses in that part of the world. It has to conform to the mandate of those who profit by hating it.

"It may be too much to expect that the committee would address itself to this aspect of the matter on Ireland's account. Since, however, they are, as Catholics, so keenly concerned over the fate of England, they have put themselves in a position which makes it incumbent on them to demand an end of partition, so that Catholics in Ireland may have the same freedom Catholics have here."

Comment

And Now Our Guns!

THE "*American Committee for Defense of British Homes*" sent the following letter to Mr. Romy McNellis of St. Paul, Minnesota:

"Dear Mr. McNellis:

"The future of the entire English-speaking world hangs on the events of the next few weeks. Everywhere friends of Britain are saying: what can I do to help?

"This Committee, of which I have accepted the chairmanship, offers an answer: put a gun for home defense into the hands of an unarmed British civilian. On the highest authority we have been informed that these weapons will greatly strengthen defense of British homes. Here is a way to help Britain stop Hitler now. Here is a way to help defend America.

"We have completed arrangements for immediate shipment of these weapons from the port of New York.

"Because of your interest in trap-shooting, you may be in a position to help.

"The chief purpose of this Committee is to collect arms to be shipped to a civilian committee in Britain. However, if you desire to help and have no arms to give, we should be delighted to receive a cash contribution to meet the cost of collecting these weapons. Any sum you care to send will be most gratefully received.

"Please use the blank at the end of the inclosed leaflet.

"Sincerely yours,
C. Suydam Cutting,
Chairman"

* * *

The above letter indicates that the committee has secured the names of members of gun clubs in this country.

The committee is certainly anxious for Union Now—on the principles sponsored by the committee.

The millions of Germans, Italians and Irish residents in America are disregarded.

Of course, these are not wanted in any program of Union Now with England.

Of course, these citizens will be considered "fifth columnists" for not selling their birthright for the British mess of pottage.

* * *

It might prove interesting to know the names of the committee's sponsors.

Quoting them from the committee's letterhead they read as follows:

C. SUYDAM CUTTING, *Chairman*
WILLIAM C. SCHMIDT, *Secretary*

Committee of Sponsors
Julius Ochs Adler
Barry Bingham
Robert Woods Bliss
Charles C. Burlingham
Evans Clark
James W. Gerard
Hon. Herbert H. Lehman
George V. Coe
Gordon Crane
John W. Davis
B. Tappen Fairchild
Major Anthony Fiala
Albert Foster, Jr.
E. Harry France
Bradley Gaylord
William J. Hutchinson
E. Hubert Litchfield
R. G. McKay
F. S. Moseley
Charles W. Ogden
William A. Neilson
Lewis Perry

National Committee
E. Chauncey Anderson
Dr. Harold Anthony
J. Augustus Barnard
George M. Bodman
Herbert L. Bodman
Arthur B. Campbell
William Campbell
Dr. James L. Clark
John B. Olmstead
Dr Wilfred Osgood
Lt.-Comm. Joseph Seligman
Andrew V. Stout
Lowell Thomas
Harold Abbot Titcomb
Robert C. Walker
Bradford Washburn
Lt.-Col. Douglas B. Wesson

No War For United States?

BOTH PRESIDENTIAL candidates promised explicitly to keep America out of war.

Cordell Hull, asked by politicians to make a supporting statement to this effect, refused to do so. The Secretary of State contented himself by observing that Mr. Roosevelt was the better suited to keep such a pledge.

SOCIAL JUSTICE believes that Mr. Roosevelt will not declare war.

We have believed that from the beginning.

Nevertheless, we are of the opinion that while America will not go to war, war will come to America.

Let us explain:

It has been our practiced policy to disparage Germany for the past seven or eight years.

It has been our policy to support the British pound sterling through our Stabilization Fund—no support being given to the German mark.

It has been our policy to increase import duties on German goods; not to increase them on British goods.

It has been our policy not only to sell small arms and munitions to Great Britain but to deprive ourselves of airplanes and "obsolete" warships for Great Britain.

These are only a few unneutral—if we may use the word — actions which Germany can not help but regard as inimical to her success.

Moreover, we are about to build 12,000 airplanes for Great Britain and, possibly, use our fleet to further Great Britain's cause.

When, therefore, will Germany start war against the United States as a result of the partisan policy which has characterized our foreign relations?

The first shot fired by Germany at the American flag will set this country aflame.

A war of defense, so it will be said, has been imposed upon us.

And all this because we tried our level best to make Germany wince out loud.

It is now being rumored that since Mr. Roosevelt promised to send no American boy outside the Western Hemisphere, he might be persuaded to fight his war of defense on the West Coast of South Africa.

Recently the totalitarians started to campaign in Africa with the idea of driving the British from that continent.

While it will be inexpedient to land American troops in Europe, and useless to land them in England, there might be some advantage in transporting them to Africa to engage the Germans and the Italians and the French who hold the strategic positions at Dakar.

* * *

Referring to the impending war, Boake Carter says the United States is in it—and in it until 1953.

Speaking at the Strong Vincent high school at Erie, Pennsylvania, Mr. Carter said:

"Man in the past 500 years has learned and perfected means of harnessing nature, but he has neglected to devise means to control himself. What he has done to control nature is now turning inward and destroying him. His only chance to survive is to turn his power over nature to control over himself."

The *Erie Daily Times* says of Mr. Carter:

"Mr. Carter, who in his time has been a member of the Church of England, an Episcopalian, and has gained a fair knowledge of Catholicism through his marriage to a Catholic, openly pleaded with his audience to place more confidence on the spiritual side of life and to cling "for dear life" to any few remaining spiritual aids before we've lost them. He quoted and requoted passages from the *Bible* and then compared the past progress of the world to the Biblical predictions.

"The speaker, who will return to the air next Tuesday after having been banned by radio for the past two years, turned to the European war and praised the Royal Air Force for the magnificent fight they are putting up with the mediocre equipment that they possess.

"Himself once a member of the R.A.F., Carter said the United States is making the same mistake that Great Britain and France made in their defense preparations.

" 'The British neglected to build enough bombers to offset bombardment planes of other nations. Whereas they maintained that fast pursuit and fighter planes was the essential part of defense, Germany was building hundreds upon hundreds of bombardment planes with which to spread destruction.

" 'They have finally come to learn that bombardment planes are the vital machines to keep the enemy off-balance and to smash him from becoming organized for a centralized attack. In other words, they prepared everything but a striking force.'

"The speaker bitterly denounced the United States for giving half of its bombers to Britain and emphatically stated he was not in favor of giving away any of our defense equipment until we have sufficiently prepared to defend ourselves

" 'Although it is not openly admitted, the United States is now participating in its second World War,' Mr. Carter said. 'We have been in the conflict since September of 1939. No, we haven't fired a gun at anybody but we have done everything else relative to warfare. We are like a car going down a steep icy hill and hoping that we will not spin around and crash before we reach the bottom.' "

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

British Jubilant

A SPECIAL cable to the *New York Times* following the presidential election said that British officialdom and the English public were mighty pleased at the outcome of the United States' presidential election.

A London news dispatch characterized President Roosevelt's victory as the biggest war news of the week, and based this assertion on the fact that President Roosevelt, a tried and true friend, was elected probably for the duration of the war.

Most persons reading this will jump at the conclusion that the war will be over in 4 years.

The British do not accept any such conclusion.

Rather, they think that Mr. Roosevelt will stay in office even if the war lasts 10 years.

Said *The Times* of London:

"To have elected Mr. Willkie would have meant something more than an immense dislocation of administration at a time when smooth working is essential. It would have meant that for two months to come—months which may well be critical in the history of America and the world—the United States would be without an effective head. Mr. Willkie could not have exercised his new functions because he would not be formally elected (inaugurated) until next January.

"Mr. Roosevelt, while remaining President until after the end of the year, would have been deprived of all authority by his defeat. It would have been an opportunity for Hitler, Europe, Japan and Asia, of which they would be quick to take advantage. The American electorate has refused to give it to them. Hitler and Mussolini are known to desire the removal of Mr. Roosevelt almost as ardently as they desire Mr. Churchill's. They have been denied that satisfaction."

20,000 Draft Names Lost!

A STARTLING story relative to draft bungling was written recently (Nov. 5th) by Frank B. Woodford, ace reporter for the *Detroit Free Press.*

The headlines of the story read: *"Draft Reported in Breakdown All Over Nation."*

The story reads in part as follows:

"Detroit draft boards Monday received copies of the master lists of order and serial numbers from Washington, but board members were more or less wondering what was to be done with them, as indications came that the draft machinery throughout the nation had broken down hopelessly.

"In Detroit, there were reports, apparently well founded, that all induction dates on which draftees were to have been taken into the Army are to be changed, with delays which may require weeks or even months . . .

"In New York, it was stated, three days after the national lottery a pile of 20,000 registration cards, for which no serial numbers had been assigned, was found hidden in a dark corner of an armory which had been used as a registration center.

"Any or all of the reasons set forth by local officials for the breakdown in the draft machinery may be correct. Among them were the following:

"1—Not enough time was given the draft organizations, including local boards, to do their work. Most of the board members were unfamiliar with their duties and had not been instructed sufficiently. In the 1917 draft, a period of three weeks elapsed between the day of registration and the lottery. This year there was one week. In 1917, three months elapsed before the first men were inducted into the Army. This time, and the nation is not at war as it was then, the original plans called for the first induction about three weeks after the lottery.

"2—The Army is not prepared to accept draftees at its reception centers. Fort Custer, with a reception center for 1,000 men, still is being constructed, and the work probably will not be completed until sometime in December.

"3—Another report is to the effect that funds are lacking to carry out the work assigned to the selective-service organization, and a delay must result until a new appropriation is put through Congress."

It would be interesting for New Yorkers to investigate the names of the 20,000 persons whose draft cards were conveniently lost.

It might be informative for committees of citizens to investigate the investigators—particularly in New York—because there is something rotten and it is not in the State of Denmark.

. . . and Fish

ONE OF THE most farcical and at the same time one of the most tragic episodes of the recent election was the ganging up of both the Roosevelt and Willkie forces against the re-election of Hamilton Fish as Representative from New York.

Mr. Fish, who for the past four years has waged a valiant battle against American involvement in foreign war, ran as usual, as a Republican.

Nevertheless, many of the leading Republican bosses opposed Mr. Fish's re-election and even went so far as to join a "Citizens Committee to Defeat Fish."

Claire Booth Luce, the wife of the head of *Time, Inc.*, and one of Mr. Willkie's main boosters, made a special trip to Mr. Fish's district and called upon voters to elect his Democratic opponent.

President Roosevelt aided the movement by adding the Congressman's name to those of Martin and Barton in his now famous triumvirate of scapegoats.

The New York *Post* and *PM* denounced Mr. Fish as a Nazi and an anti-semite.

The reason for all this unusual opposition was simply that Mr. Fish is opposed to war.

He has consistently advocated a peaceful settlement of the European conflict and a policy of no-meddling abroad.

His record has made him anathema in the eyes of both New Dealers and the interventionist Republicans who controlled Willkie.

When election day came around, however, the people of New York returned Mr. Fish to Congress by a large vote!

The ordinary Christian American wants peace.

He was given a chance to vote squarely on this issue in the Fish campaign.

He was not given a chance to vote on this issue in the Presidential race as the warmongers saw to it that both the Democratic and Republican candidates were interventionists.

If voters had been permitted to choose between an interventionist and a non-interventionist, there would have been no third term.

Comment

Crack-Pots

MR. BLAIR MOODY, Washington correspondent for *The Detroit News*, took time off to comment on the outcome of the recent election.

Substantially, he indicated that, although all the "crack-pots" of the country had supported Mr. Wendell Willkie, nevertheless, the Republican candidate lost.

Mr. Moody specified, among others, Dr. Townsend and Father Coughlin. As a matter of record, Father Coughlin did not personally enter into the recent campaign whatsoever.

Aside from that glaring error, which we call to Mr. Moody's attention, let us remind the gentleman that *The Detroit News* — its publishers and editors — *advocated the election of Wendell Willkie!*

Not a pretty compliment to the corporation from which this Washington correspondent receives his daily bread!

It is estimated that 90 per cent of the newspapers throughout the country also opposed Mr. Roosevelt's re-election.

Presumably, this 90 per cent of newsjournalists who supported Wendell Willkie are not "crack-pots." They are representative of educated publishers.

Probably, these newspapers were not only sincere but are gifted with as much intelligence as those publishers, who supported and voted for Mr. Roosevelt.

Intemperate words spoken by such a well-known journalist as Mr. Moody will contribute nothing to the much-desired unification of America.

Hurling the epithet "crack-pots" at the opponents of any candidate is a totalitarian trick employed by those bent upon establishing a one-party form of government.

Incidentally, the newspapers who are in business to make money realize more revenue from their advertisers than they do from their subscribers.

If 90 per cent of the news-journals of America — the largest majority in the records available to us — failed to influence the public to vote as the newspapers wanted them to vote, it is time for the owners of these publishing corporations to bring to the attention of their several boards of directors the following questions:

1. Have newspapers receded from the position they once maintained in influencing the public?
2. When will newspapers begin to campaign for a living annual wage for labor?
3. When will newspapers begin to advocate a peace-prosperity rather than a prosperity based upon war?

Marcantonio

ALTHOUGH the Communist Party was banned from the ballot in half of the 48 states, it gained an important victory on November 5—the re-election of Representative Vito Marcantonio from the 20th Congressional District in New York City.

Mr. Marcantonio ran on the American Labor Party and Republican ticket, but that was only window dressing.

It was the same kind of a deal that resulted in the election of Fiorello LaGuardia as Mayor of New York a few years ago.

Like the "Little Flower," Mr. Marcantonio has no ties or loyalty to the two parties that elected him.

Just as LaGuardia, the so-called Republican, has always been a New Dealer, so Mr. Marcantonio, who is officially listed as an American Laborite, is really the representative of the Communists.

Nicknamed "The Little Napoleon of Harlem," Mr. Marcantonio has already contributed a spotted history to the annals of contemporary politics.

A former law partner of Mayor LaGuardia, he was the Mayor's campaign manager in 1932 when LaGuardia was defeated for Congress.

In 1934, he himself took a stab at running for Congress from LaGuardia's district and got the job.

Nineteen thirty-six found Marcantonio out of Congress because of a few hundred votes which went to his opponent, James J. Lanzetta.

However, with the help of the Communists, the American Labor Party and a hands-off policy ordered by the Republican boss, Kenneth Simpson, Marcantonio went back to Washington in 1938.

Looking back at his record in his 1936 campaign it is interesting to observe his peculiar brand of political tactics.

In that year he was indicted by a grand jury on a second degree felonious assault charge in an attack on a Post Office employe.

The employe, his head swathed in bandages covering deep gashes caused by a blackjack, charged that Marcantonio had instigated an attack on him when he had accused two men at the polling place of being "floaters."

Freed because of lack of evidence, Marcantonio became more and more active in left-wing movements. During his last term in Congress he faithfully followed the Communist Party line up and down its scurvy path.

When Moscow ordered its satellites to whoop for war against the Nazis, Marcantonio whooped.

When the Reds became doves of peace, he accused the Dies Committee of fomenting war hysteria.

Marcantonio, moreover, was the only Congressman to vote against the new appropriations for National Defense.

Mr. Marcantonio's re-election was hailed with unrestrained rejoicing in the *Daily Worker* and its Yiddish-language subsidiary.

John Lewis — Hail and Farewell?

THE NATION is aware of the pre-election promise made by John L. Lewis—a promise to resign his high position as head of the C.I.O. should Mr. Wendell Willkie lose.

Willkie lost—lost not because of the support tendered him by John Lewis but in spite of it.

SOCIAL JUSTICE has been critical of Mr. Lewis—particularly because he surrounded himself, in notable instances, with communistically-inclined radicals.

However, be it remembered, SOCIAL JUSTICE and its founder, Father Coughlin, both advocated the formation of an organization such as is the C.I.O.—and for many reasons.

The industrial working man had been left to the rapacious mercies of profit seekers.

For almost thirty years the American Federation of Labor dilly-dallied with the mass production worker, failing to organize him—failing, on the one hand, to build a shield for him against the assaults of organized industry; and, on the other, failing to put a sword of justice in his hand wherewith he could defend his God-given rights.

It was John L. Lewis—possibly the greatest labor organizer in the history of America—who came to the rescue of the industrial worker.

Thanks to John L. Lewis—more than to any other living person—collective bargaining was legally established in America on the large scale which characterizes it today.

To the following words of an editorial appearing in the current issue of *America*, SOCIAL JUSTICE *says* "Amen":

"Unfortunately, the C.I.O. soon encountered stormy weather. In his fight with the great industries, Lewis needed organizers, and needed them badly. If his C.I.O. project failed to win a majority of the unorganized workers, his claim to speak for them would lack all validity.

Organizers were at hand, but a closer examination would have shown many to be men and women with whom honest workers could not associate. Their first allegiance was neither to the wage-earner nor to Lewis, but to Moscow.

"Possibly Lewis believed that he could use these wreckers, and control them. If so, he failed.

"Lewis is not a Communist, and never was, but his apparently friendly association with Communists, and his silence when the Communist technique was used to foment sit-down strikes and other forms of violence, gave rise to the suspicion that he had gone over to Moscow.

"We welcomed the C.I.O. and supported its leader, as long as it seemed to us that the means he used to attain a laudable end were proper. But since our first interest in organization is the welfare of the worker, we did not hesitate to criticize Mr. Lewis when we believed he was wrong.

"His support of the sit-down strike, and his appointment of Harry Bridges as his representative on the West Coast were, it seemed to us, indefensible. Further, when he aligned the C.I.O. with a political party, and assessed the workers to raise a campaign fund of half a million dollars, he established a precedent that will return to plague organized labor. It has, in fact, returned in the fight over the personnel of the Labor Relations Board."

* * *

The C.I.O. apparently is more moderate now than it was two years ago—more moderate in its actions.

Nevertheless, in notable instances radicals dominate unions affiliated with the C.I.O.

It will be a matter of sincere regret if Mr. John Lewis resigns his position of leadership; for we recognize that there is no personality appearing upon the horizon in the ranks of labor capable of holding together the C.I.O. and making it a thorough-going American institution.

Labor's war in no sense is won. The fiercest battles are still in the offing.

Following this World War; following the shut-down of factories which will throw millions of men into the ranks of unemployed, Mr. Lewis will be needed sadly to stem the tide of revolution which, possibly, might swamp us if it will be backed up by the hurricane of radicals and fellow travelers of Communists.

Therefore, SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine pleads with John L. Lewis to reconsider his determination to resign.

America needs this leader more than ever, now that he has seen the full light of day.

As far as organized labor is concerned, its local leaders should forget their pre-election bitterness to petition John L. Lewis to remain as their leader.

Comment

Father Coughlin Versus Katharine Fitzgerald

FROM West Haven, Connecticut, came a letter last week signed by Katharine Fitz-Gerald and addressed to Father Coughlin.

Although exception may be taken to certain statements contained within the letter, nevertheless it is so good that the Founder of this National Magazine passed it on to the editorial offices for us to read.

In turn, we thought it advisable to print it:

"Dear Father Coughlin:

'In November, 1936, I thought I would write you a letter but I put it off so long my material became stale; so that no letter was written. Again, in 1938, I thought of writing you the election results and again it was not done.

"Today, the day after the national election, before my thoughts cool off, I am dashing off this letter to you.

"In 1936, with a great deal of hard work your followers secured enough signatures to put the Union Party on the voting machines in Connecticut; before going on to 1938 and 1940, I will tell you a few things about 1936.

"After doing all this work to secure a place in the sun the followers of social justice, or the Union Party, immediately started in to fight—and in an indirect way, you, yourself, were and are a great deal to blame for it. You are constantly talking about politicians, forgetting that, according to Noah Webster, you are the greatest politician in the United States.

"I have been in politics since the women got the vote—I have worked for clean, progressive politics as outlined in SOCIAL JUSTICE; I have never taken a penny in my life for politics, but I have sense enough to know that unless you work in numbers and use your vote you will never get anywhere.

"A study club may be all right if what you study is vital to the community you live in; but if, like the League of Women Voters, you gather in groups and decide on a measure that is absolutely necessary, in your eyes, and for the good of the community, and then neither the Republicans nor the Democrats include it in their platforms. If you go to the polls and vote as Democrats and Republicans, you are in the same spot you started from.

"In 1936, after securing a place on the voting machines, instead of all working for the good of the group as I said above—they fought. In all my political life I never saw such experienced amateurs. The heads knew all about bargaining for money and keeping it—and should anyone disagree with them, immediately they hurled the epithet 'politician' and Father Coughlin at the dissenter.

"Dr. William O'Connell of West Haven, one of your most faithful followers, asked me to organize West Haven. I did. We had a splendid group, small but intelligent. But the 3,500 votes Dr. O'Connell expected to poll dwindled to 552; however, we paid all our debts and closed up honorably. Connecticut in 1936 polled 21,000 votes and we lost.

* * *

"In 1938, in order to hold our place on the voting machines for the national election in 1940, we presented a ticket to the Secretary of State. This, in turn, was reviewed by the Superior Court and three days before election the decision was rendered. We were not important enough to put a ticket of our own in the field, so we endorsed the major candidates on the Republican ticket. We polled 3,046 votes; were the balance of power; elected the Republican governor. And, more important, retained our place on the machine.

"Now, to 1940—We presented to the people of Connecticut; or, more to the point, the followers of Social Justice; the enclosed platform—a ticket endorsing some Republicans, but also some of our own candidates; a real American ticket.

"Our intention in presenting this ticket was to hold the Union Party together because it is such a difficult job to get on the machines in Connecticut. There was no thought of personal gain in any of our minds. But as was the case in 1936 and 1938, the Social Justice Study Clubs, as they call themselves, stabbed the project in the back. We polled as low as 35 votes in some places, losing our place on the voting machines. It was wasted effort—I sent out 5,600 letters such as the enclosed.

"I do not know just what to say to you. Charity tells me to make no comment. Then, again, I think of you being hundreds of miles away, believing you are addressing intelligent Americans—when you are not. Your SOCIAL JUSTICE followers have done you more harm as a priest and as a fellow American, I think, than has ever been done to any man before. No matter what they want to put over—the most flagrant intoleration, the most un-American scheme—they look a person calmly in the eye and say, *'Father Coughlin wants this done.'* Every one of them 'is in constant communication' with you; you 'wrote' them.

"Forgive me if I tell you that, as a group, they are the worst looking lot of people gotten together. The majority of them don't know what it is all about. One or two leaders do all the talking, and for anything they want to put over they say, 'Father Coughlin' and, after the roar of applause has died out, the subject is never mentioned again; but they take it for granted, like Mr. Roosevelt—they have *carte blanche* to go ahead in your name.

"There are supposed to be 50 or 60 thousand social justice followers in Connecticut. Your last week's paper advised they vote for Mr. Willkie against the third term. Less than 500 voted that way.

"They talk Father Coughlin; they bandy your name around in their shops; they get into fist fights in your name; like all uneducated groups, they quote what they have heard or someone else has read without giving a thought of their own. In fact, they are going along like a lot of sheep getting nowhere but to the slaughter.

"If you must have study clubs, why don't you have constructive ones—parliamentary law, child welfare, and above all, the value of their vote?

* * *

"This letter is not written in bitterness. You were not bitter when they ran out on you in 1936. But it is written with a hope that with your splendid analytical mind you can visualize what has happened in Connecticut. Unfortunately, I know nothing of Ireland first-hand, but from what I have read, and the more I study my Catholic friends, the more I am forced to believe that the 800 years during which England held them in bondage was due to the traitors in their ranks.

"What is the matter with our people? I talked with one of our priests Sunday after Mass and he said: 'Just what is the Union Party; who are behind it; what are your objects?'

"I answered as a starter: 'Well, it is actually the outgrowth of the original Father Coughlin group.'

"I got no further; he shrugged his shoulders and said, 'Oh, that one! I thought you had more brains!' And he went off without even saying he was in a hurry.

"I have been in politics all my life. I believe in politics; I believe that every intelligent man and woman who is interested in this great American Republic should be interested. Next to my God, my love is my country. No one thinks for me.

"I believe that the Union Party was a strong potent factor in the life of this country. In fact, a Yale professor of law sent for me and said, 'I hope you are not going to let the Union Party die—it is the first time in Connecticut we had a truly American party with high ideals.'

"Acting on this advice along with others, I went ahead. I am not sorry we have lost, but I am very sorry that the rank and file of the voters had so little vision that they could not see the great force for good they had in their hands.

"We couldn't get a line of publicity in the papers. We have not yet been able to find out just what amount of votes we cast. Connecticut politics (Democratic) are so rotten that I don't think we will ever be able to get on the machines again.

"Respectfully yours,

"**(Sgd. Katharine F. Fitzgerald)**

"P.S. I think you should disband all organizations in your name. They are no credit to you. Individuals who write you and read SOCIAL JUSTICE are a greater asset to you than members of a group who are being led around by self-centered individuals whose only object in mind is themselves."

* * *

For Miss Fitzgerald's information, Father Coughlin has no "organization."

For Miss Fitzgerald's further information, Father Coughlin sponsors no study clubs or groups, nor does he authorize any person to speak for him.

Definitely, more harm has been done to the Pastor of the Shrine of the Little Flower by self-appointed representatives who pretend to talk for him and act for him.

And, as a result, decent persons, constrained to believe newspaper comments about "Coughlinites," who are no more Coughlinites than Communists are Americans, have thought unkindly and have spoken unkindly of a man whom they do not know and whose writings they have not read.

Rest assured, Father Coughlin has no organization and has not had any since the National Union was abandoned in 1936.

It is true that he did *encourage* the establishment of study clubs and groups—but these study clubs and groups were totally independent of him.

As far as sponsoring any political party or semblance of a political party is concerned, Father Coughlin, like many Americans, is ashamed of the trend taken by political parties in America.

We are sure that Miss Fitzgerald will welcome this information — and so will thousands of others who may have labored under misinformation.

Persons desiring to contact Father Coughlin should do so directly and not through any self-appointed agent or spokesmen.

Comment

Why Spain Is On the Blacklist

SPAIN HAS probably never gotten a fair deal in the United States.

While all too many Americans have for many decades idolized and still idolize Great Britain and sometimes sets its interests even a trifle ahead of those of our own nation; while for over a century and a half France has been the object of constant admiration and almost love on our part, no matter what she did — while these particular preferences were and are being shown certain nations, Spain has long been a subject of derision and hatred in American public opinion, in books, magazines and newspapers, and, of course, in harangues of anti-Catholic agitators.

"Proofs of this mentality are evident and manifold," declares the *Herald* of St. Louis, which continues:

"Particular evidence was offered only a short time ago during Spain's fight under Franco for freedom. Apart from a small element of our population other than Catholics, almost everybody in our country followed the lead of certain individuals and of our secular press, and sided with the Communist-inspired and Communist-aided revolutionaries who ultimately were vanquished by the counter-revolutionary movement inaugurated for the recapturing of Spanish liberty and the re-establishment of justice.

"An influential majority of our people evidently wished rather to see Spain become and remain Communistic and necessarily atheistic than to permit the people to recover their own country for themselves and for freedom of religion in it, with Catholicism, indeed, the most powerful religious force.

"Among the reasons for this attitude (and this is but one illustration of it) are these:

"1. Spain is and long has been predominantly Catholic. She is not 'the oldest daughter of the Church' but she is one of the most faithful members of the family of the Church. Spain has, by and large never wavered, and even the last king-mother, Christina, was devoutly Catholic and exerted a powerful benevolent Catholic influence upon the people and upon her son Alfonso, with whose exile the rule of the crown and scepter ended, to make way for something that, in the case of Spain, was less beneficial.

"2. Spain withstood, to a remarkable degree, the inroads of the Reformation, which split Germany asunder, sorely afflicted France, troubled Belgium, and triumphed in Holland, Norway, Sweden, England, Scotland and Wales. Spain has never been forgiven for this loyalty and perhaps never will be forgiven by those who consider such loyalty an outrage and a proof of unprogressiveness.

"3. Spain, when she was powerful, was long compelled to regard England as an enemy and to treat it so. That too is not apt to be forgotten by people who look upon things and events though British glasses.

"4. Spain has kept herself comparatively free from the attempted inroads of that division of Freemasonry which has exerted so unwholesome an influence for so long a time throughout Europe and on other continents. That is another mark against that noble nation.

"5. Catholic Spain — except for the Catholic Tyrol — is the only nation that successfully resisted the tyrant Napoleon . . .

"6. Spain has not surrendered as fully to the system of unscrupulous finance-capitalism as have some other countries . . .

"7. Spain has lately regained her liberty from the tyranny of a foreign-incited and financial regime of Moscowites and sympathizers with Moscow. This regaining of liberty for themselves by the Spanish people is, because of propaganda, deemed a revolt against 'Democracy,' although in this instance the terrible thing that was the Russian-controlled government was anything but democratic.

"To this complaint has been added the charge that the present falangistic organization of Spain, which many expect to lead to the introduction of the Christian corporative order urged by several Pontiffs, is constantly being designated as 'fascistic' . . .

"When you hear or read disparagements of Spain, you may rest assured they are due to some or all of the enumerated causes."

$60-Billion Debt

No; the national debt has not yet reached the $60-billion mark. But Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., is proposing that our national debt limit be raised to $60-billion.

And, more than that, he is about to ask for new defense taxes.

In this instance Mr. Morgenthau is candid enough to state that the new debt limit —up $20-billion over the 1939 model— might not hold good beyond June 30, 1942.

Probably, by that date a request will be forthcoming to sky-rocket our statutory debt limit to $100-billion—and more taxes will be imposed upon our people.

It appears that with the present purchasing power of our dollar it is almost an economic impossibility for our citizens to carry a $100-billion debt or even a $80-billion debt.

To do so, it would be necessary for the Government to raise prices 20 per cent and to increase salaries 20 per cent. All that would represent a normal inflation.

By the way, it might be advisable for those of you who have a nest-egg of dollars to begin buying things—things of real value —a small home, a small farm.

The writer most certainly would prefer to have his money in a piece of profitable real estate than in the bank when inflation comes.

Tomorrow's Reckoning

"THERE IS a plague of land hunger abroad in Europe such as has not scourged the Continent since the Mongols, on their wild ponies, rode out of the East, and the Goths poured over the walls of Rome," says a recent editorial in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch.*

The editorial continues:

"Already Hitler has seized the most fertile fields of France. Stalin has hoisted the hammer and sickle over the Baltic states and half of Poland. Mussolini has taken a nibble at the French Riviera; he is casting greedy eyes on Greece, and licking his chops at the prospect of an African empire.

"This disease of empire-building is a contagious one. Even the Graustarkian Kings of Roumania and Bulgaria and the Admiral-Regent of Hungary have played at it. For Roumania and Bulgaria, as for Poland before them, it seems to have been just a matter of fattening themselves for the slaughter. So far, the Hungarians have had the better time of it.

"This country was reduced to 28 per cent of its former size by the *Treaty of the Trianon.* That's where the pangs began. However, since Hitler made ropes of sand of Europe's boundaries, Hungary has grown astonishingly.

"But Budapest is far from sated. Lest the people forget greed for so long as a day, a huge electric signboard has been erected along the Danube. Leland Stowe describes it as, in its first phase, a map of 1919 Hungary. In the second phase, a series of lights go on to show the jackal's share of the Czech Republic. More lights indicate the annexation of the sub-Carpathian Ukraine. Still more of them indicate that part of Transylvania that is now Hungarian. And beyond them all is the old Hapsburg frontier.

"There is also a Liberty square in Budapest, where the flag is always at half-staff. It is an appeal to patriotism to support new grabs, to transgress at Bethel and multiply transgression at Gilgal.

"But to what purpose is all this aggrandizement? Only to add to the acres of a small ruling class, to the domains of the old monasteries and to the crown lands. Each new grab means more acres for the Esterhazys, not for the landless peasants.

"But are not the Esterhazys piling up tomorrow's reckoning? Their country is such a land as Spain was, and is again. It is a poor realm in which they are rich. They do not realize that blind patriotism can wear thin, and that riches, seen through its opening seams, can be a goad to the landless and the hopeless. In Spain it was so strong a goad that the land ran blood.

"Is not all Europe piling up tomorrow's reckoning?

"Is not a French *clique,* after being party to the loss of the country's freedom through selfishness and inept command, seeking to forge new fetters for the people?

"Has not a Russian *clique* transformed high ideals into shackles?

"Is not a German *clique* perpetrating a fraud in disguising regimentation with the labels of Socialism and nationalism?

"Is there anywhere, except in England, so much as a glint of understanding that the way to a brave new world is the way of more for the many, rather than more for the few?

"Perhaps Europe needs a new empire — an empire in which a German would not seek to live at the expense of a Frenchman, a Hungarian on the neck of a Bulgar. Perhaps Europe needs a new order that goes far beyond the ideals on which were founded that shade of a shade, the League of Nations. But can this new super-nationalism rest on the sword and the knout? Can it exist for the benefit of the few and at the expense of many?

"Will there not come on some tomorrow a realization of the new oppression? And if tomorrow comes?"

Comment

Stalin, the Enigma

IN CELEBRATING Josef Stalin's 50th birthday, back in 1929, the official Soviet press published an article entitled "Stalin, the Enigma."

And to this day Stalin remains an omnipresent and inscrutable enigma; for as the "front" for unseen forces, he schemes unsearchable plans and spins undetected webs.

Soviet Russia, like the sprawling British Empire, always fears being drawn into a war on two fronts at once.

Lying clear across the world's greatest land mass in both Europe and Asia, with one frontier in warring Europe and the other in the Pacific — and these connected only by the 6,000-mile thread of the Trans-Siberian railroad from Moscow to Vladivostok — Russians simply cannot fight any war on two fronts against both Germany and Japan.

This may help to explain the cordial reception extended to Lieut. Gen. Yoshitsugu Tatekawa, the new Japanese ambassador to Moscow, when he presented himself recently before Dictator Stalin.

The reception was unprecedented; for never before has Stalin personally welcomed a Japanese diplomat.

But Tatekawa's mission was important. He had gone to Moscow in pursuance of the terms of the Rome-Berlin-Toyko axis and of its companion, the seemingly incompatible "Berlin-Moscow treaty," to draw up terms for a future *Tokyo-Moscow axis.*

The Rome press predicted on October 30th that Moscow would soon announce the formulation of an agreement with Tokyo and that, at the same time, Stalin would approve of the axis incursions into the Balkans.

Germany, you see, could offer Russia help in getting its long dreamed-of "warm weather spot" on the Indian Ocean. Russians have fought many wars in their heretofore unsuccessful efforts to get an outlet to the sea that is not frozen over for part of the year.

The Russians are all too well aware of the fact that the government of Iran, *backed by the British government,* built a railroad from the Caspain Sea to the head of the Persian Gulf — outlet for Stalin's hoped-for approach to the sea.

* * *

Now, Russia acting in Iran, threatening Iraq, and operating not far from the borders of boiling, seething Nationalist India, will be far removed from any immediate German interests and would harass only England.

This new threat would weaken England's insular defenses, thus necessitating the transport of British troops and planes to the defense of India.

Soviet armies, moving through China down from the north, and through Iran and Iraq, would create a grave military situation for Britain. And, once again, the British would be fighting on multiple fronts.

* * *

The Balkans and the Dardanelles, furthermore, constitute another of Stalin's many headaches.

While Italy drives on Greece, Hitler will begin his *putsch* towards the Mediterranean through Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece.

Here, Stalin is vitally interested; for Russian czars have yearned through the centuries for control of the Dardanelles, Russia's only exit from the Black Sea.

But Russia, although approving openly of the axis moves, will continue undercover work in the Balkans.

Soviet Russia, supposedly, has freed Turkey from all obligations. Thus, Turkey, the only nation strong enough and willing to fight Germany and Italy, is free to wage war in defense of the Dardanelles.

Although Turkey may not go to the aid of Greece, Turkey will, nevertheless, fight if her own territorial integrity is threatened. Turks prefer to fight in their own defensive positions which they have prepared through the years for just this momentous event.

Turkey does not want the axis powers to control the Dardanelles and through this control to extend sovereignty over the Near East.

If the Turks are defeated, and if the Germans pass through Turkey, then the Suez Canal cannot be defended.

The Russians, too, are watching for any threatened axis move on the oil fields in Iraq and Iran. Great Britain holds these at present. But if Germany and Italy were to capture them, Nazi troops would be too close for comfort to Russia's rich oil fields at Baku and Russia's seaports in the Caspian.

Soviet Makes Deals With Both Sides

IN SIDING WITH the axis through the Moscow-Tokyo agreement, Soviet Russia is in a unique position to threaten India, the jewel of the British Empire, which long has been restive under British rule.

The Soviet has an army now aiding the Chinese Communists and these combined red armies could be sent from North China against India. Soviet armies operating from Iran and Iraq, as pointed out previously, could apply further pressure.

Within India the Nationalists groups have been whipped to frenzy and hatred by Communists agitators and propagandists.

These Indian Nationalists may prove to be Britain's gigantic "fifth column" which may prepare India for conquest by Soviet Russia's red hordes.

Japan and Thailand are already cooperating to demand the return of Burmese territory to the Siamese and permit Siamese and Japanese troops to operate against Malaysia and Singapore.

For three long years Soviet Russia has been shipping arms, munitions and other war supplies to the Chinese Nationalists and Chinese Communists through Mongolia. Through the recent arrangement Russia has agreed to close the North China road to war supplies for Chiang Kai Shek, in exchange for the sphere of influence which Japan will grant to Stalin in North China.

Thus, Soviet Russia abrogates its tentative agreement with the United States and England, wherein she promised to speed up the flow of vital war materials to the Chinese in their battle against Japan.

Soviet Russia can, and will, make treaties with both sides to prolong the war and safeguard her own devious interests.

The Burma road has been reopened; but if Soviet Russia lives by its agreement with Japan, the North China road will be closed.

Russia's biggest worry, as far as Japan is concerned, is Valdivostok. This Soviet air and sea base has been called a "dagger aimed at the very heart of Japan" only 500 miles distant.

Japan even justified her present war with China by pointing out that Russia, through frequent and persistent incursions into North China, was threatening the existence of Japan and that, therefore, Japan had been forced to war against China, to keep out the Soviet and Chinese Communist hordes.

However, Soviet Russia's pacts are as enigmatic as Russia's pact plotter — *and the unseen forces for whom he fronts.* Stalin knows that Hitler has failed to conquer England. So long as England commands the seas, Soviet Russia's warm water ports are useless.

But Stalin believes that the best interests of Russia lie in a continuous exhausting and paralyzing war for the rest of Europe. When Germany and England have become exhausted, Soviet Russia will become active.

Soviet Russia, therefore, will not now fulfill its promises to march into Iran or India; for that would be too much of a help to the axis partners and the war would be too short.

Russia will continue to permit driblets of foodstuffs, copper and oil to go through to Germany. This aid will not be decisive enough to aid Germany completely; but it may serve to prevent Hitler from annexing Ukraine to get food.

In the long view, Soviet Russia can be depended upon to pursue her way of peacefully prolonging the war, which — all revolutionists hope — will end up in the sovietization of Asia and Europe.

Beware Russia's Help

THE ANNOUNCEMENT that the United States, as well as Great Britain, is "courting the good will of Soviet Russia in the present international crisis is not reassuring," observes the *Boston Post.*

"Surely our diplomats, as well as those in England, know by now that the present Russian government cannot be trusted," the Boston editorial warns.

"It is a nation controlled by the most ignoble motives in modern history, far more lethal to civilization than any we know. Hitler himself was partially a creation of world sovietism, and his excesses were encouraged deliberately at the beginning of this war by Stalin.

"Her record as invader of Poland is a grim one. She fell upon a helpless, Christian nation after it had been crushed by the *blitzkrieg.*

"She looted its farms and liquidated its churches. She filled a noble people with fear and desolation.

"And as if this were not enough, she then started her attack upon Christian Finland. Her unwieldly armies were cut to pieces for a time, but she enforced her heartless demands by sheer brute force.

"Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania were taken over by the greedy Russian bear. She leaped at the chance to help dismember the kingdom of Rumania. She was consulted by Germany in regard to the Japanese pact. As a matter of record, she made a truce with Japan a year ago to enable that nation to drive deeper into China.

"Russia is the friend and apostle of aggression.

"We cannot name a power in the world more dangerous to peace. She is the enemy of religion, no matter what the denomination. She is the foe of republicanism and free enterprise. She has debauched and bribed nations in all parts of the world.

"Her highway through the last 23 years has been paved with the bones of her victims. She has been condemned by the forces of decency and morality everywhere.

"Russia is the friend of no nation. Witness what her friendship did for Spain!

Swords vs. Plowshares

All Europe Facing Winter of Privation

THE WORLD is beginning to receive statistics on the harvest which is supposed to carry the peoples of warring Europe through another Winter of death, disease and destruction.

Available now are the first reliable figures on the Fall harvest; figures not based on calculation but on the actual harvest.

The imminent shortage is critical.

In normal years, continental Europe imports more than 8-million tons of grain from overseas.

Most of the nations of Europe are not economically or productively self-sufficient and few — if, indeed, any — of these nations have exportable and saleable surpluses.

Those who have surpluses, even in the best harvest years, may raise as much as 2,700,000 tons of grain for export to other European nations. Of these 2,700,000 tons, 2,300,000 tons come from the Balkans.

This year, neither France nor Spain — in normal times the only countries outside the Balkans which can produce more grain than they need — has enough for home consumption and domestic needs.

The civil war in Spain has devastated fields and dislocated production to the extent that Spain cannot feed its own people, and will be forced to rely upon shipments of wheat from North and South America.

But, since grain cannot be imported because of the war blockades, hundreds of thousands of refugees from the combat zones are doomed to starve to death in neutral Spain and Portugal.

The war in France has ruined the harvest for this year and all available grain stocks have been requisitioned by the Nazis, both in occupied and unoccupied territories; so that the inhabitants of France, too, must starve unless they are fed by the Reich.

* * *

In the Balkans, Roumania accounts for only 50 per cent of Europe's grain surplus. But this year international mobilization, threat of war, and highly unfavorable weather has curtailed the harvest yield about 20 per cent.

Moreover, Roumania has lost fertile areas to Hungary and Soviet Russia.

As far as Hungary is concerned, she is part of the German sphere of influence and, therefore, her surplus will go to peoples now living within the political and economic spheres of the axis powers.

The resources of Bessarabia and Bukhovina, now under Russian domination, are at the despotic and dictatorial disposal of Josef Stalin.

Hence, Germany may expect less than half of its normal grain supply from Roumania.

Stalin is not feeding the other peoples of Europe when his own citizen comrades are starving. More than a million Russians starved to death last year!

Furthermore, you may be sure that Mr. Stalin is not losing this golden opportunity to capitalize upon starvation and famine in Europe; for Stalin — and *the unseen planners for whom he fronts* — hope after the war to create a "United States of Soviet Europe" upon the wreckage of general destruction and devastation.

* * *

The harvest in the rest of the Balkan countries is equally unfavorable. Hungary has very little surplus wheat and, for the first time in years, Hungary has been forced to look for imports of maize to substitute for other grains.

The crops of Yugoslavia reached the lowest levels in years and this nation which used to export has now to import large quantities of maize.

Greece, even before the onslaught of the present war, had a deficit of 10-million bushels, as Greece consumed 48-million bushels a year.

The crop in Bulgaria is just sufficient to fill the most urgent needs even with strict rationing of the citizens. If Bulgaria is drawn into the present Balkan war, then she, too, must import grain or starve.

Accordingly, Europe requires well over 10-million tons of grain this year to maintain refugee and local populations through the Winter. If we take into consideration the wanton waste of food and the devastation of productive facilities through war, the needs of Europe may be increased to 12-million or 14-million tons.

Grain reserves in Europe remaining from last year, even after strict rationing, are not high.

Little Switzerland possesses grain stocks which, supposedly, will last until 1942. But what is enough for Switzerland's 4-million citizens is a piddling pittance for Europe's 400 millions.

Through the Winter many other neutral nations will exhaust their reserve stocks, in spite of strict rations tantamount to near-starvation. The warring nations have exhausted all reserves and are trying to replenish their stores by confiscating the dwindling stocks of conquered countries.

* * *

There may not be starvation in Germany or Italy this Winter. The Nazis have taken everything they needed from the conquered and subjugated countries and hoarded these stores in the Reich.

However, cut off from overseas by the blockade, Germany and Italy cannot afford to wait until their reserves are exhausted. The dictators must keep their stores well filled: if they do not want to be at the mercy of Soviet Russia to the East.

* * *

Soviet Russia has taken over the Baltic States and two rich Roumanian provinces, a great loss for the axis' food supply.

The only European country with a bumper grain crop this year is the Russian Ukraine.

Now, this is the same Ukraine that Adolf Hitler earmarked for conquest, annexation and subjugation by the Reich in *"Mein Kampf."* The annexation and conquest of Ukraine is one of the few plans outlined in the book which has not been fulfilled to date.

There are persistent reports that in recent months the Nazis have again assembled prominent Russian exiles and counter-revolutionists who are preparing for a large-scale underground movement against the Soviet in the Ukraine.

These reports go on to say that Stalin has become greatly annoyed, and that as a countermove Communist parties all over the world are launching an anti-axis drive.

The very crucial food question might easily lead to a rift between Berlin and Moscow.

If there is starvation among the nations surrounding Germany and subject to Germany, these defeated peoples will rise in red revolution and again, as after the World War, there will be a harvest of blood reaped from the seeds of famine and deprivation.

Empty Schools— Jobless Teachers

THE DECLINE of 37,319 in the number of children in the public schools of New York is reportedly "almost twice the reduction which had been forecast by the school board when it drew up its budget request for the fiscal year."

In an editorial comment the *New York Sun* asserts that "a decreasing child population may be pleasing to some eugenists: to most other people it means fewer jobs, more vacant apartments and reduced demand for shoes, cereals, toys, bicycles, vitamin preparations — and schools.

"Even in a school population of more than a million," the *Sun* continues, "a decrease of 37,000 pupils is sizeable enough to produce a marked effect. It is equal to more than a thousand classes, or the entire school population of a city like Syracuse. If the trend should keep up for many more years, New York will find itself with a vastly oversized education system, both in buildings and in teaching personnel."

For the past few years the average decline in the number of pupils in the public schools has been 20,000. This year the elementary schools lost 29,283 pupils, against an estimate of 24,890 in the official forecasts. The junior high schools, which had been expected to gain 1,400, lost 3,421. The senior high schools, which it was anticipated would remain at their previous levels lost 3,421, a total loss of 40,916. The vocational schools gained 3,597, making the net loss of 37,319.

Statistics indicate that there has been a slight increase in the number of births since the low of 98,507 in 1936. Last year the births in the city totaled 102,261. The estimate for 1940 is 106,000. This means that five or six years from now the current losses may be reduced by ten per cent, which will have no perceptible influence in solving the problem of "fewer jobs, more vacant apartments and reduced demand for shoes, cereals, toys, bicycles, vitamin preparations — and schools."

"The problem," says the *Catholic News* of New York, "is moral. Unfortunately there are millions of people in this nation whose philosophy is such that they ignore all moral arguments. They may understand the economic ones stressed by the *Sun*, which once more demonstrate that "the wages of sin is death."

Hollywood's Campaign

Film Stars Took Sides in a 'Tug-of-Votes'

THE RECENT election marked the first time in history that Hollywood movie stars actively and publicly campaigned for candidates of their choice.

In former years the film moguls frowned on any participation in politics by their screen employes on the ground that it might not sit well with movie goers.

Viewing the situation strictly from the business end, one is inclined to see the point — maybe.

Assume that you are a dyed-in-the-wool Democrat, a loyal party-liner who wouldn't vote for your own father if he were running on the Republican ticket.

You get tired listening to the radio some night and decide to take in a movie. You are dying to see *"The Life and Loves of Scarface McGonnicle."*

But you discover at the last moment that Scarface is played by Reginald Quixote, a contemptible Republican. His leading lady is Cynthia Sauercraut, a notorious G.O.P. spokesman who stumped the country in behalf of her party ticket. You refuse absolutely to pay a dime toward their salaries, which you know are used in part to help finance the party of opposition.

So you stay at home and listen to Fred Benny, because you have a friend who knows a fellow who has a cousin who lives next door to Fred Benny's aunt and, therefore, you have it on good authority that Fred Benny is neutral.

By staying home you have deprived Hollywood of revenue it otherwise would receive. Perhaps hundreds of thousands of other potential movie goers would act as you did. This would in time ruin Reginald Quixote and Cynthia Sauercraut as box office attractions and they would be relegated to playing such parts as a voice in a ghost picture.

Aside from the business standpoint, another theory has been advanced for the former lack of political enthusiasm of screen heroes and heroines. In the old days of roaring Hollywood the film folk were too busy raising ned and marrying each other's spouses to pay much attention to things politic.

During the late campaign, however, conditions were different. For some reason or another, the movie bosses cast aside their erstwhile objections to electioneering. Actors, actresses, directors and writers took to the hustings like Tom Harmon does to football.

Not that Hollywood has overcome completely its predilection for funnery. Reports continue anent several juicy scandals which have not yet been given a public airing.

But Hollywood did find time to toss its grease paint into the political arena.

And Hollywood was found to be a house divided against itself.

Attracting wide attention was the 6-column advertisement inserted in the *New York Times*, October 31, stating *"Why We of Hollywood Will Vote for Roosevelt."*

Names of 186 actors, actresses and others prominent in the movie colony appeared as sponsors of the ad.

Purporting to show that Hollywood was solidly for Roosevelt, the statement declared that "as independent voters, we have been aroused by the incredible and sinister distortions of the truth by which the forces behind Wendell L. Willkie have attempted to obtain the favor and suffrage of American voters."

Willkie's supporters "have their eyes on the past," it continued. "They wish to return to it, to its inequalities and its special privileges."

Their ad continued: "Vast amounts of money and months of secret preparation have been lovingly spent in polishing Mr. Willkie's script.

"We have read the script. It is 'phoney'!"

And then the *Hollywood for Roosevelt Committee* signed their names:

Pat O'Brien
Joan Bennett
Bryan Foy
Sid Grauman
Ralph Block
Myron Selznick
Harry Joe Brown
Irving Reis
Walter Huston
Robert Benchley
Priscilla Lane
Jane Wyman
Frank Capra
Katharine Hepburn
Henry Fonda
Betty Grable
W. S. Van Dyke, II
Sally Eilers
Hugh Herbert
George Cukor
John Ford
Mary McCall, Jr.
Peggy Moran
Rosemary Lane
Andy Devine
Thomas Mitchell
Richard Arlen
John Cromwell
Charles Bickford
Humphrey Bogart
Ralph A. McMullen, *President, United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 78*
Philip Dunne
Ralph Murphy
A. Edward Sutherland
Mark Sandrich
Harlan Thompson
Jesse L. Lasky
Melvyn Douglas
Ben Thau
Kenneth MacGowan
Sol Lesser
Garson Kanin
Burt Kelly
Milton M. Black
Robert Lord
Robert Fellows
Lewis Milestone
Irving Pichel
Ray Enright
M. C. Levee
Raymond Griffith
Ralph Blum
Charles Butterworth
Leo Morrison
B. P. Schulberg
Alfred Newman
Albert Lewin
Sam Lewin
Blake McVeigh
Jerome Kern
Louis Bromfield
William Castle, *Business Representative, Studio Carpenters No. 946*
Irving Reis
Harry Kurnitz
William Koenig
Dwight Taylor
Frederick Ullman, Jr.
Gordon Hollingshead
Talbot Jennings
James Cagney
Don Hartman
Dudley Nichols
Eddie Quillan
Stuart Erwin
June Collyer
Judith Anderson
Fred S. Meyer
Phillip Epstein
Julius Epstein
Rosalind Russell
Jack Leighter
Mischa Auer
John Larkin
George Bancroft
Claude Rains
Rose Hobart
"Rochester" Anderson
Buck Jones
James Gleason
Lucille Gleason
Russell Gleason
John Garfield
Margot Stevenson
George Raft
Abe Lastfogel
Ritz Brothers
Dorothy Parker
Alan Campbell
Herbert Aller, *Business Representative, IATSE Cameramen Local No. 659*
John W. Considine, Jr.
Alice Faye
Douglas Fairbanks, Jr.
Dorothy Lamour
Edward G. Robinson
Sidney Toler
Leo Carrillo
Miriam Hopkins
Winfield R. Sheehan
William Wyler
Walter Wanger
Sam Jeffe
Collier Young
Robert S. Taplinger
Billie Burke
Ira Gershwin
Allen Rivkin
George Oppenheimer
Leo Forbstein
Nunnally Johnson
Anita Loos
Dore Schary
Thomas E. Jackson
Richard Connell
Joe Cawthorn
Robert Armstrong
Edmund Grainger
Leonard Spigelgass
Milton Sperling
Milt Gross
Herbert Sorrell, *Business Representative, Moving Picture Painters No. 644*
Helen Deutsch
William Robson
Horace McCoy
Rian James
Mary Baker
David Hempstead, Jr.
Billy Wilder
Nat Perrin
Harry Tugend
Eddie Welch
Arch Oboler
Irving Brecher
Jerry Wald
Edward Kaufman
Stephen Morehouse Avery
Abem Finkel
Harry Trivers
John Huston
Robert Presnell
Arthur Caesar
Doris Anderson
Melville Baker
Tom Kilpatrick
Gertrude Purcell
Gene Solow
Gladys Lehman
Jesse Lasky, Jr.
Richard Maibaum
Charles Grayson
Edward North
Joe P. Tuohy, *President, Studio Transportation Drivers No. 399*
Howard Benedict
Islin Auster
William H. Pine
Paul Jones
David Lewis
William Cagney
Joseph Santley
Carl Laemmle, Jr.
Leigh Jason
Fritz Lang
Lew Seiler
P. J. Wolfson
Michael Curtiz
Jack L. Warner, Jr.
Westmore Brothers
Ralph Rainger
Leo Robin
E. Ray Goetz
Dorothy Stiles
Harry Akst
Reeves Espy
Sydney Blackmer
Humphrey Cobb
Ernst Laemmle
Leslie Mason, *President, Screen Publicists Guild*

Incensed that the Roosevelt group should presume to speak for Hollywood, another band of 168 motion picture folk, equally prominent and equally patriotic, inserted a rebuttal ad of 4 columns in the same newspaper the day before election.

It was entitled *"The Truth About Hollywood"* and expressed "our desire to correct a statement made in the advertising columns of this newspaper a few days ago . . . a statement which indicated that all of Hollywood . . . all of the mighty Motion Picture industry . . . are supporting a Third Term Candidate."

"Somebody Made a Mistake . . . The TRUTH is . . . We of Hollywood . . . inspired with a spirit of unity . . . are opposed to the New Deal and the Third Term.

"The TRUTH is . . . Thousands of workers, directors, writers, technicians, administrative employes, executives and stars . . . have set aside personal interests to contribute their untiring efforts to elect Wendell Willkie."

As Bing Crosby said in a last-minute round-up of political speech making: *"We have read the script and we like it . . .* we'll carry a spear in your picture any time" and then, the Willkie supporters signed their names:

Bert Allenberg
Eve Arden
Edward Arnold
Edward Arnold, Jr.
Fred Astaire
Lew Ayres
Tom Baily
Fay Bainter
William Bakewell
Vilma Banky
Lionel Barrymore
Richard Barthelmess
George Beban, Jr.
Wallace Beery
Enid Bennett
Phil Berg
Joan Blondell
Monte Blue
Mrs. Humphrey Bogart
Hobart Bosworth
Charles Brackett
El Brendel
George Brent
Sam Briskin
Helen Broderick
Cecil Carle
John Carroll
Chick Chandler
Mrs. Andy Clyde
Irvin S. Cobb
Charles Coburn
J. J. Cohn
Charles Collins
Hallam Cooley
Gary Cooper
Frank Craven
Broderick Crawford
Donald Crisp
Bing Crosby
Cecil B. DeMille
Katherine DeMille
Pedro de Cordoba
Frances Dee
Reginald Denny
Walt Disney
Claire Dodd
Dean Dorn
Irene Dunne
Peter DuRey
Nelson Eddy
Harry Edington
Lucille Fairbanks
Fanchon and Marco
W. C. Fields
Susanna Foster
Gene Fox
Jesse Graves
Corinne Griffith
E. H. Griffith
Jules Goldstone
Barbara Gurney
Jonathan Hale
Porter Hall
Beatrice Halstead
Eric Hatch
Margaret Hamilton
Nedda Harrigan
Irene Hervey
Hedda Hopper
William Hopper
Edward Everett Horton
Rupert Hughes
Bernie Hyman
Mrs. Thomas H. Ince
Thomas H. Ince, II
Ethel Jacobsen
Allan Jones
King Kennedy
Doris Kenyon
Guy Kibbee
Ival Kidwell
Carlotta King
Ida Koverman

(Continued on Page 19)

Press Views on the Election

A Vote of Confidence, and an Opportunity

A VOTE of confidence in President Roosevelt, that was neither a "landslide" nor a "mandate," is the composite press view of the unprecedentedly heavy vote on November 5th.

As the *Baltimore Sun* said: "Everyone is in agreement that national unity is imperative . . . imperative to place the economic life of the country on a sound and durable basis . . . imperative to produce the men and materials required in the defense program . . . imperative if war should come to this country."

But many editorials stress the obligation which now rests upon the New Deal administration to achieve national unity by winning to its support the 23-millions who voted for Mr. Willkie.

In short, President Roosevelt has his vote of confidence, but with it the obligation of allaying the fears of those who voted against the perils of a third term and war.

* * *

". . . Loyal yielding to popular will is the greatest of democratic traditions, and it is an American tradition," said *The Detroit News*, which added:

"But if that and the free ballot are essentials of democracy, there is a third factor which, under certain circumstances, may be all but essential.

"That third factor is the crowning achievement of democratic statesmanship; namely, a wise consideration by the victors for the views of the minority.

"Americans by the millions supported and voted for Wendell Willkie. Those millions sincerely believed, and must still believe: That the third term risks dictatorship; that, the President's pledge notwithstanding, his present course leads toward war; that New Deal hostility to business has postponed the recovery of prosperity.

"Greatly though the President may scorn these beliefs, greatly though he may have resented them, a wise statesmanship on his part henceforth will not ignore them. It lies within the President's power, by word and deed, to allay the fears, the sincere fears, that lent bitterness to the campaign now happily behind us.

"It lies within his power, the power of his political genius, to achieve the national unity, the era of good feeling, which Wendell Willkie sincerely hoped to achieve. By his wise leadership President Roosevelt can now give this country peace and prosperity at home and that unity of purpose which will confound foreign foes — an America confident and impregnable."

Roosevelt to Write the Next Chapter

THE EDITORIAL comment of the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* was typical of many newspapers which had supported Mr. Willkie. This "bible" of Ohio's newspaper readers said:

"It would be idle for the *Plain Dealer* this morning to pretend anything but disappointment over the result of the presidential election. We departed from a practice of a century to support Mr. Willkie, believing him the better qualified to administer the Federal Government in the critical period now at hand. For this we have not a single regret. We made the fight. We bow to the decision.

"It seems clear enough that, except for the troubled situation abroad and the possibility of American involvement, the President could not have won the election.

"Two fears vied with each other in the electoral mind. One was the fear of what might happen to the democratic way of life if the no-third-term rule were broken. The other was that if the conduct of the Federal Government were now turned over to untried hands the wolves of continental Europe might make a feast of us.

"The second fear proved stronger than the first. The American people are willing to take a chance on the third term in return for the security they feel in having in the White House for another four years a man they believe alert and capable in matters of foreign policy.

—St. Louis Post-Dispatch

'TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES!'

"No other candidate the Chicago convention might have named could have achieved this triumph. There is certainly no reason to believe that any other man the Republicans might have nominated could have made as good a race as Mr. Willkie made, even though he lost.

"Wendell L. Willkie emerges from the contest with credit to himself and to those responsible for his candidacy. It is hoped he will continue to make himself a factor in public life. He has a talent for the kind of leadership needed to make our democratic two-party system work.

"It was his fortune to be pitted against an administration which had a command for this battle of ballots the greatest army of job holders and beneficiaries this country had ever seen. Checks from the Federal Treasury scattered in showers over the countryside constituted an argument more powerful than any plea in support of an unwritten law.

"Mr. Roosevelt himself would be less than human if he did not, in view of yesterday's great new vote of confidence, feel obligated to do everything possible to justify the unprecedented mark of favor.

"If the President would now inaugurate a house-cleaning of his administration, ridding it of its irresponsible hangers-on and replacing them, if at all, with citizens who command public respect, the action would go far toward disarming the critics who have decried his dangerously radical tendencies.

"Regardless of the outcome, the American people yesterday made a decision destined to rank as important history. They definitely broke with their democratic past. They discarded the precept and practice or great presidents to give this one a third term.

"The next chapter will be written by Mr. Roosevelt. May he have wisdom in the writing of it!"

Willkie Agreement Obscured Issues

"THE PLAIN truth is," said the *Milwaukee Journal*, "that Mr. Willkie *accepted and approved so much of the New Deal that there was not enough left in people's minds to show where he differed.*" The Wisconsin newspaper then counselled:

"Those who have won are to be disappointed in some of their hopes. Those who feel they have lost are not to be defeated until they give up.

"We have all had our say. We expect to have our say in the years ahead. Until someone tells us we can't say what we want, we are better off than any other people in the history of the world. For those who won and those who lost, one thought must be the same:

" 'We like America, we aim to help make it work'."

* * *

It would be a great advance for unity if the rest of the country could be given grounds for the confidence which impells the *Boston Post* to say, for example:

"Fortunately for the country, Mr. Roosevelt is not the kind of a man who wants power for its own sake, and can be trusted not to try to create a dynasty."

* * *

"It would be fatal," adds the *Washington Post*, "for Mr. Roosevelt to regard yesterday's victory as merely a personal tribute or as a mandate to do as he pleases. The dominant factor in the campaign and in Mr. Roosevelt's re-election was the extremely dangerous international situation. It was the grave menace that confronts us across the Atlantic and Pacific which determined the outcome. In these critical times the people felt that it would be safer to keep Mr. Roosevelt at the helm rather than trust it to a man whom they deemed untried by actual experience in important public office."

And in similar vein the *New York Times* subjoins:

"In such an election the victorious party gains no mandate to harass or belittle its opponents. On the contrary, at this time above all others it is under a solemn obligation to strive for all possible unity with them, within the limits of their party pledges."

(Continued on Page 14)

Comment

(Continued from Page 13)

Electoral Vote Not a 'Mandate'

THE *New York Times* in a still later comment rejects the "mandate" idea. "Merely to cite the electoral vote of 468 to 63, would be to give a much exaggerated impression of the actual extent of Mr. Roosevelt's endorsement by popular vote," the *Times* points out, adding:

"There is certain to be a great deal of discussion in coming weeks regarding the nature and extent of the President's new 'mandate.' We have no way of knowing precisely what considerations weighed most heavily with each of millions of voters in recording his or her choice. But it is fair to interpret the result of the election as an endorsement of the major foreign policies of the Roosevelt Administration . . .

"If Mr. Roosevelt has thus received a clear vote of confidence for the chief foreign policies of his Administration, what 'mandate' has he received from a majority of the electorate in the field of domestic policy? Mr. Roosevelt emphasized two major points when he asked the American public to support him at the polls. The first, of course, was his desire to safeguard and to expand the social reforms which his Administration has introduced. The second was his statement of faith in the fundamental soundness of the present economic structure of American democracy."

* * *

This is echoed and approved by the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch:*

"For the first time in the history of this nation, a President has been elected for a third term. The breaking of this old tradition must be ascribed, we believe, to the gravity of the international situation and to the unwillingness of millions of citizens, because of that fact, to turn at this time to a new leader. To put it the other way, it is unbelievable that, if the world were at peace, Mr. Roosevelt either would have run for a third term or that the people would have elected him . . .

"To have national unity, however, we must have not only the patriotic unity of our people but the kind of leadership that soars above all bitterness, all resentment, every petty consideration. Mr. Roosevelt must prove — he must quickly prove — to those who could not support him that the campaign predictions of one-man rule, of black disaster, of loss of the American way of life if he were elected to a third term are totally baseless.

"The country has given him more power than it has to any other President, except in time of war. He must not abuse this power. He must be on guard against his impulses, as he has not always been on guard against them in the past. There must be no more purges, no more incidents like his attempt to pack the Supreme Court, no more destroyer deals without the consent of Congress."

Doubts Ability to Restore Unity

BUT THE *New York Herald Tribune*, in an election eve comment, continued frankly skeptical:

"The truth is that Mr. Roosevelt could not restore unity if he would. He has spent eight years installing class warfare as the political foundation of the New Deal. He would bring with him into a third term so many widespread envies and hates and rivalries as to make reconciliation a hopeless task."

* * *

The *Pittsburgh Press* also saw and stressed the obligation of creating confidence and unity. Said the *Press:*

"The campaign was a bitter one. It came at a time when America was confronted with great dangers from abroad.

"For that reason it is essential that the result be accepted in good spirit and that the American people again unite in the common purpose of making this nation so strong that no dictator or combination of dictators can endanger it . . .

"The President made a solemn pledge that this country has no secret commitments abroad, and that it will stoutly adhere to a policy of peace so long as the actions of other nations make peace remotely possible. This is an obligation of the most serious nature.

"There is a double task ahead of us — ahead of the President and ahead of the people, both Democrats and Republicans alike. This double task involves attaining maximum military preparedness in the shortest possible time and the building of a better domestic economic structure.

"These are tasks which require an united people."

* * *

The newspapers of the Hearst auspices carried a concert of comment substantially as follows:

"The Hearst newspapers were not in agreement with the majority of the people the last two times Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate, and were especially in disagreement on the issue of granting him a third term.

"However, the Hearst newspapers have never questioned the *right* of the American people to give Mr. Roosevelt a third term, or any other number of terms he may seek and they may see fit to grant.

"It was the *wisdom* of giving him, or any president, a third term which was gravely questioned.

"The Hearst newspapers have always supported Mr. Roosevelt in what they considered to be his good policies, and have only disagreed and criticized when their conception of what was good for the country was at variance with his acts.

"They will *now* support Mr. Roosevelt when he deserves to be supported, and will continue to disagree with and criticize him when that is called for in the service of the nation."

Nation's Press Agrees on Need of Unity

IN BRIEFER excerpt form, the editorial reading staff brings you the following additional comment from various quarters of the nation.

New York Daily News — "Barring a near miracle of which no indication has appeared yet, the no third term tradition has been kicked out the window by the American people; John L. Lewis can now be called on to step down as boss of the CIO; Al Smith and the other take-a-walkers have walked clean off the lot; Big Business' attempt to put one of its own men in the White House has been defeated . . . and the champ is still the champ . . . The best thing for all Americans to do is to close ranks."

* * *

New York Herald Tribune (Republican) — "The country is still enormously wealthy. From the economic point of view it can probably withstand four more years of New Deal obstruction and destruction. But can the independence of the voters . . . survive four more years of paternalistic direction and handouts from Washington? We say with all solemnity that the nation needs Wendell Willkie today more than ever."

* * *

Worcester (Mass.) Telegram (Republican) — "Mr. Roosevelt has definitely lost the confidence of too many millions of Americans. This great body of suspicion and apprehension will make his third term exceedingly difficult, not only for him but for the whole country. His motives will be questioned, his ambitions feared. There are bound to be misunderstandings with Congress."

* * *

Boston Herald (Republican) — "Many Americans will regret the outcome deeply and be disturbed at the possible direct and indirect consequences."

* * *

St. Paul Pioneer Press (Independent) — "The duty of the victor is to conduct Government in such a way that unity and not division will be the result of this democratic decision."

* * *

Minneapolis Tribune (Independent Republican) — "Today, more than ever in history, the United States needs an alert and an independent opposition. Once the two party system breaks down, the way is open for one party rule."

* * *

Richmond Times Dispatch (Independent Democrat) — "A primary obligation upon Mr. Roosevelt in this fateful hour is that he strive to heal the breach which undoubtedly exists in the ranks of the American people. The fervor which thousands expended on behalf of his opponent must be harnessed to the building of America's defenses."

* * *

New York Daily Mirror — "Democracy will wither and die from its roots to its topmost fruit unless the winning party and its candidate can achieve, immediately, a national unity which will embrace the whole people of America."

* * *

Philadelphia Inquirer — "Solely because Mr. Willkie's courageous leadership and the vigorous sincerity with which he discussed the issues, the campaign was a fight to the finish and not a walkover. And who shall say that democracy, to be strong and grow, doesn't need hard-fought political campaigns?

"In unity of the people there is national strength and integrity. Let us, above all, be a united nation, facing ahead, ready for what may come."

* * *

Baltimore Sun — "These millions who would have rejected Mr. Roosevelt if they could are the people who for traditional or personal reasons reject the idea that the Government of the United States should be the dispenser of largesse, the general purveyor of jobs, the custodian of the individual as well as the national welfare.

"The test of Tuesday was a severe test and a disappointing test. But its loss does not mean that the cause is lost. The cause now has a tried and proven leader."

(Continued on Page 15)

Comment

(Continued from Page 14)

Boston Herald — "President Roosevelt stands on a pinnacle to which we have not chosen to elevate any other American. May the eminence awe him into modesty, forbearance and magnanimity. Let us hope that he will abate his partisanship of the last few years, rise above party, set himself resolutely to the grinding routine work of economic rehabilitation, fiscal soundness, class-appeasement and national unity and not ignore the ideals which Wendell Willkie expressed. Only the President can make this a cohesive and contented nation. May his star of destiny lead him along the right path!"

* * *

Hartford (Conn.) Courant — "The country has accepted his (Roosevelt's) assurances and entrusted its destiny to his hands for four years more. It will stand unitedly behind him in his conduct of foreign affairs provided he does not construe his victory as a mandate to police the world."

* * *

San Francisco Chronicle — "The nation will now go on with the immense tasks before it.

"This campaign has been hard fought. That is the right of the people; it is also the health of the nation. When the people are so deeply concerned that they will go to the mat for their beliefs they gladden the spirit of democracy. The other half of that is that when the contest is over they accept the result and join to try to make it succeed. That has always been the American way.

"It will be the American way now if we read Wendell Willkie aright, and many millions of Americans share our opinion of him, he will be found continually battling for the unity of this nation and the preservation of its democracy.

"In that cause let all Americans stand together."

* * *

Des Moines (Iowa) Register — "It was the fact that the Republican standard bearer accepted the farm program as a going concern and pledged himself to continue it — for reasons that, as he stated them, not even Wallace would quarrel with — that gave the Republicans a chance to recapture some lost farm support.

"The Republican party rehabilitated itself in part in the minds of the farm-minded. If McNary and some others had followed consistently the Willkie line, it would have done still better.

"The *Register* considers it a real gain for agriculture in America to get the two parties into line as to general purpose and as to the main thing in the implementation of it."

* * *

Syracuse (N. Y.) Post Standard — "It is a mandate to continue strongly the foreign policy President Roosevelt has been pursuing. It can be regarded as nothing else than a vote of confidence in his conduct of international relations."

* * *

St. Louis Globe Democrat — "The people have now placed their future unreservedly in the hands of Mr. Roosevelt, with implied authority to go on in the way he has been going. The full responsibility for whatever may come, therefore, must rest upon him. Let us hope that he will himself be profoundly impressed by the tremendous weight of that responsibility; that he will realize to the full extent the grave necessity for national unity in the conditions which confront us, a unity which cannot be accomplished when class antagonisms are encouraged and promoted."

* * *

Kansas City Star — "Great problems confront America — problems of recovery, problems of national defense. These cannot be solved by a divided country. Americans must not and will not repeat the French mistakes. *The Star* is confident that the patriotic and loyal men and women of both parties, supporters of the New Deal and opponents alike, will rally to the momentous tasks ahead. Past is past. The future is what counts."

* * *

Buffalo Courier Express — "The United States is facing the gravest crisis in its history. It is a time when personal and party likes and dislikes must be subordinated to the considerations of national welfare. We cannot believe that President Roosevelt will regard yesterday's expression as a mandate to war or to any abandonment of a single principle of our great democracy."

* * *

Newark (N. J.) Star Ledger — "A confused majority of four million is ample to decide an election, but hardly enough to solidify the ranks of the nation against alien ideologies. The President must and, we believe, will seek the support and respect the opinions of people of all shades of economic thought who are determined to preserve the broadest liberties of the people. Millions of voters who supported Wendell L. Willkie sincerely believe that America suffered an injury in the blow to the tradition against a third term. These people should now open their minds and hearts in the hope that the President will make up for the sacrifice of tradition with zeal for the substance of our liberties."

* * *

Minneapolis Times Tribune — "If Mr. Roosevelt had supposed that the farmers of the Middle West were completely satisfied with his administration's agricultural program, he must now be disillusioned. For the vote in this region suggests a sharp revolt against that program, and a well defined demand that something better than Mr. Wallace's patchwork of panaceas and stopgaps be devised in the interest of agricultural stability."

* * *

Omaha World Herald — "During the campaign both sides predicted that a dire fate would fasten itself upon the Republic if the opposing candidate were elected. The fears of the Roosevelt supporters are now washed out. But the fears of the Willkie supporters remain. Only President Roosevelt can dispel them. And he can do it only by adopting policies so sound, so thoroughly American, unflinchingly realistic, that no thoughtful citizen can stand out against them."

* * *

Louisville Courier Journal — "The President is re-elected on terms which leave him free for the highest statesmanship of which he is capable. There is no more excuse for 'politics.' . . . The people have given Mr. Roosevelt his vote of confidence and in return they ask magnanimity, daring and imagination. Nothing less in the way of leadership can meet our terrible need."

* * *

Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier — "Were the *News and Courier* able to persuade itself that present conditions will last indefinitely in the United States, the result of the election would be more than satisfactory to it. It would join in the jubilation. The *News and Courier* cannot throw off its fears. We wish we could think of ten successive years of colossal deficits, in time of peace, without thinking of inflation, the equivalent of confiscation of private property."

Press Free to Err

IN THE selection and presentation of news, every newspaper reflects the judgment of those who control its policy, observes the *Washington Post* in a thoughtful moment of introspection.

"What some newspapers regard as fit for publication others prefer to ignore," the editorial goes on. "Items that appeal to readers of one paper may have little interest for those of another paper reaching a different group of people.

"Since we have a free press in this country, it is at liberty to satisfy the idiosyncrasies of its readers or of its editors and publishers. It does not have to wait for official permission to print news. Neither does it have to print contributed items under duress. This liberty to decide what has news value and how the news shall be presented is the first essential of a free press.

"Such freedom would have very little value if the press permitted its news and editorial policies to be dictated by selfish special interests seeking to mislead the public. Yet that very charge is brought against the majority of American newspapers by Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

"Angered by the way in which certain items bearing on the Presidential campaign have been handled by leading metropolitan dailies, Mr. Flynn declared that 'the newspapers of the country are under a real dictatorship, a financial dictatorship of their advertisers.'

"No doubt there are a few newspapers against which such accusations can justifiably be brought. Such venal publications can safely be tolerated, however, because they cannot long survive. Any paper that systematically distorts or suppresses news to gain advertising or curry favor with financial interests risks loss of its readers. And advertisements go only to those papers that are able to hold reader interest.

"There is no rule or formula by which to decide what constitutes front-page news. That is necessarily a matter of judgment. And that judgment may be influenced by many factors, including public criticism, Government propaganda, appeals from advertisers and political pressure. No newspaper can be entirely insulated from these numerous influences arising from the community which it serves. But a paper which succumbs to pressure from any of these sources is not likely to survive as a medium for general dissemination of news.

"Mistakes of judgment are inevitable. A certain amount of prejudice is unavoidable in presentation of news, since complete objectivity is an unattainable ideal for fallible human beings. But anyone who believes that the great majority of our newspapers deliberately attempt to mislead the public is not only ignorant of the newspaper world but also blind to the refutation of that view which is afforded by the printed page."

Letters

(SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally, the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.)

Reach New Readers

TO THE EDITOR:

Every effort should be made to get SOCIAL JUSTICE into the hands of new readers.

I suggest that every subscriber, after reading it, should send it to a friend; particularly friends living in country places.

I think also that persons subscribing to it when corresponding with friends should put a P.S. on all communications, "read SOCIAL JUSTICE."

Christians must wake up now or be for generations lost, our liberties are crumbling through neglect and indifference.

—K.A.H.

Fort Worth, Texas

Hiding the Truth

TO THE EDITOR:

I have some information which I think you ought to have and which you might want to check into, namely that three branches of the Public Library do not display SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine in their reading racks.

About a month ago I inquired at one branch and the lady in charge said they have it and it should be in the rack, whereupon an assistant who was standing by *brought two copies from under the counter* and she told this girl that it should be in the rack, but apparently it was put back under the counter as it is still missing from the rack.

After this experience I visited a second branch and the magazine was given to me from a *desk drawer*. When I asked why it wasn't kept in the reading rack she said with a smile, "I don't know, it just isn't."

On October 25th, I visited another branch and found the same condition. She said the October 14th issue was the last received but could not locate it and thought someone had "carried it off," which, of course, is possible. She said they have so many magazines that they could not display them all.

When I told her of my experience and that I thought someone had ordered it kept out of sight she said they had not received any such orders or she would know about it.

It might be a good idea to cover this case in an early issue and suggest to readers in all localities to see that their local libraries have copies of SOCIAL JUSTICE on file, if not on display.

—O.G.L.

Cleveland, Ohio

Not Our War

TO THE EDITOR:

In his newspaper column of October 17th, Gen. Hugh Johnson asserted that certain groups sought to have our country become embroiled in war with Germany, mainly in order to satisfy a racial grudge against Hitler.

On Oct. 30th one Alexander Loeb, a Jewish gentleman, replied to Johnson in a letter that admitted in part that Mr. Johnson's article of October 17th contained truth.

Recently, through curiosity, I saw the pictures, *"The Ramparts We Watch,"* and *"World In Flames."* For sheer, undisguised propaganda, designed to whip a docile, liberty-loving people into a craze for war, these pictures are unsurpassed.

Can't we, as a Christian and true American people, in the name of God and peace put two and two together at this late date?

Shall we go to war for the sake of racialism and the profits of a few war makers?

I urge defense, certainly — but not war. We will not be attacked, from without. We are being attacked from within — by warmongers.

God save America from all war seekers.

—M.J.K.

College Point, N. Y.

Money Mystery Fades

TO THE EDITOR:

That mysterious subject "money" so often exposed in simple terms by Father Coughlin, gets another shellacking in the *"Constitutional Money Advocate"* edited by Chas. G. Binderup.

The recent article entitled *"Temple of the Thirteen Suns"* by Robert H. Hemphill in the *Advocate* was so plainly written anyone can absorb it.

Mr. Binderup and his associates are "going places" and deserve all the support loyal Americans can give.

The Constitutional Money Advocate, Minden, Nebraska, is a monthly magazine, illustrated, with clear, readable type.

The "great money mystery" loses ground as our army of the informed grows.

—C.E.R.

Philadelphia, Pa.

They Still Like Us

TO THE EDITOR:

I have been a student of Father Coughlin's school over the radio for eleven years and of SOCIAL JUSTICE since the first copy came out.

It is with great sorrow this year that we have to do without Father Coughlin on Sunday afternoons.

But the magazine in its present form is better than it used to be, and I read it with great interest and pass it on to others when I'm through.

—R.W.

Union City, N. J.

Country's Resources Best Medium of Exchange

TO THE EDITOR:

I have just finished reading SOCIAL JUSTICE of the 4th of this month, which interested me very much. SOCIAL JUSTICE has been good reading for me since its first year of publication.

I cast my first vote in 1872. My vote went to Horace Greeley electors, not so much because he was running on the Democratic ticket, but because he was a Lincoln Greenbacker. I had read a book on money, which convinced me that *our medium of exchange should be based on the resources of the United States*, and not on silver and gold standard.

However, in 1873, England sent one of her Representatives over here with a half million English dollars, to induce our Republican President to get his arms quietly around the neck of our Congress and demonetize silver and put us on a single gold standard, which they did, unbeknown to the rank and file of the consuming masses.

Prior to the demonetizing of silver, there were few banks in the United States, but immediately afterwards, the banks sprang up all over the country like mushrooms over night. From that day our medium of exchange has been credit money, backed by interest-bearing gold bonds, the interest on those bonds is paid by the consuming masses, by a Government indirect consumption tax.

So, from 1873, I had no use for the Republican party nationally, and put my trust in the Democratic party until 1934, when I quit the Democratic party and became a non-partisan.

I had come to the final conclusion that both of the old parties were like a yoke of oxen named Buck and Bright, Buck being on the "nigh" side, the nearest to the common people he was called the Democratic Ox, and Bright being on the "off" side, the farthest away from the common people, he was called the Republican Ox. They have been yoked together with a capitalist yoke, and have been driven by a capitalistic driver, and, since 1873, have been going in one direction, winking their eyes at the capitalistic classes, and wiggling their tails at the consuming masses.

Under this capitalistic rule, we have two distinct forms of taxation. One is the direct or property tax, and the other form is the indirect or consumption tax, and if we fail to pay our direct tax, the collector may confiscate our property; but if we do not pay our indirect consumption tax, and charity does not step in and pay it for us, we can starve to death.

—G.T.H.

Port Angeles, Wash.

A Letter From President John Adams

TO THE EDITOR:

The following extract from a letter of that great patriot, John Adams of Massachusetts, the second President of this Republic, addressed to Benjamin Rush and dated July 5, 1808, may be of interest:

"Our Gazettes and Pamphlets tell us that Bonaparte will conquer England, and command all the British Navy, and send I know not how many hundred thousand soldiers here and conquer from New Orleans to Passamaquoddy.

"Though every one of these bugbears is an empty Phantom, yet the people seem to believe every article of this bombastical creed and tremble and shudder in consequence.

"Who shall touch these blind eyes?"

—A New Englander

Ogunquit, Maine

Enslaved by Greed

TO THE EDITOR:

The day has arrived when the farmer and the factory laborer must unite that they both do not become economic slaves. They must unite to combat that vile, contemptible evil which is greed in despair, veiling itself as legal capitalism.

Do not mistake me, for I am not referring to the morally legal use of productive capital, but I am referring to the corrupt abuse of idle capital which is controlling the grain prices of the farmer—forcing him into economic slavery and is also controlling the factory laborer and forcing him into a machine slave.

Modern capitalism is trying to create hatred between the farmer and the factory worker; it is playing one against the other, and will eventually, if not curtailed drastically, conquer both.

The greedy, vile abuse of idle capital, is the greatest detriment and burden a free people have ever endured; and if not abolished, will ultimately make economic slaves of all free people.

—J.M.H.

Delphos, Ohio

Let Us Talk Peace

TO THE EDITOR:

I would like to urge all our readers, through the columns of the paper, to start a campaign—NOW—against this vicious move, called *"Union Now."*

We, here in our city, have used the J. Thorkelson article in August 19th *Congressional Record*. This should be sent for and widely distributed by all who are interested in saving this country from complete "British" domination.

They are moving in on us, by the hundreds, and these "British" have unlimited funds.

Another thing, we should support the gallant *"Defend America First" Committee*. Talk PEACE, PEACE, PEACE everywhere — business contacts, social contacts, and everyone we meet.

—E.S.

Clarksburg, W. Va.

Letters

'Truth Crushed to Earth'

TO THE EDITOR:

Now that the enemies of our Christian civilization have succeeded in silencing the Radio Priest, Father Coughlin, they may think that they have won a great victory, but truth can never be stamped out by silencing its tellers.

The pendulum of time will swing, and it will react against the forces responsible for curtailing free speech.

This latest episode is not new: One can go back to the time of Christ, when even He was crucified, *even when He was speaking the truth;* and so were the Apostles silenced. But Christ triumphed over His enemies, and so will the cause that Father Coughlin has been preaching for the last thirteen years.

In a world when leaders think only of the material things of this earth, what could be expected of them?

Unless the American people turn to God and live like real God-fearing Christians, this country will meet the same fate as some of the older countries in Europe have met.

All believers in Christian social justice should double their efforts now, to help boost up the distribution of one of the few remaining organs of truth, that we have today, SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine. Let's make it a 100% campaign.

Fort Randolph, Canal Zone—E.J.L.

A Word for Lloyd's

TO THE EDITOR:

Somewhat behind in my usual reading of SOCIAL JUSTICE, it is only now that I have come upon your issue of September 2, 1940, wherein I find on page 7, the page of "Comment," the caption, "*Lloyd's of London.*"

Having been a student of insurance matters and methods for many years, I would naturally be interested in anything the Senator of North Carolina might have to say on that subject.

I hope SOCIAL JUSTICE does not subscribe to what the Senator is reported to have said. The gentleman must have spoken without much thought as to what he had been saying. He certainly speaks without knowledge, for much of what is reported is false and should not be repeated.

Hollywood, Calif. —M.C.

We Only Serve

TO THE EDITOR:

A stronger Hand than ours must wield our fate. Our hands are not the hands of Providence.

Of our accord, we serve with our hand the dish taken from a greater Hand than ours, to be relished by a greater depth of Will than ever we have ascended.

Of our work, we are *not* the master; of our destiny, we are *not* the captain.

We are the tools by which the hand of Providence engraves its honorable distinction on memorial stone.

Leominster, Mass. —B.F.

A Student's Letter: She Hears About China

TO THE EDITOR:

Two years ago at the Western High School, a minister, a Dr. Fisher, lectured about China. He said he had spent 32 years of his life in China and made the trip 16 times and he said that when he would be through talking to us that many would not like him because he was going to say many things about the British.

I am sorry to say that by a strange coincidence the eminent gentleman died shortly after that lecture.

He told us how the richest poppy seeds which are raised by the British in India are turned into opium and peddled to the Chinese and how they are "doped"; and about the battle of the Boxers' Rebellion. The most interesting part of his talk was how China was agricultural and Japan was industrial, that those two nations are of Mongolian Race and that they are like husband and wife and we should leave them alone. They fight, but they will get along if we don't butt in.

We should mind our own business, he said, and explained that Japan has no natural resources and it wants to expand into China but the British are afraid if it did, it may drive the British out of China. He told us how the British exploit the Chinese and how they had all the trade bottled up, so that everything that went into China and out of China was taxed by the British.

He also said that the British call the Chinamen "yellow dogs" and that they don't want them. The Chinese where he stayed were good people and he loved them and was sorry for them.

It made me stop and think ever since I was a little girl, Sisters begged for pennies from us children for the poor children in China because the mothers threw them away and Sisters picked them up and raised them.

Why should we Americans send pennies to China, while British exploit them?

Why should Americans help Britain when they have so much that the "sun never sets on" their possessions?

And why should our American boys spill their blood for Britain when Britain does not want English women to bring children into the world?

Do they think it is cheaper to get our American boys than to raise their own?

Well, we raised our own, we need them, and we are going to keep them!

Detroit, Mich. —S.G.

Playing With Fire

TO THE EDITOR:

Please put these questions before the people:

1. Are the British and American "democracies" to end in Communism by a suicide pact?

2. Does "aid short of war" mean "play with fire and you don't get burned"?

3. Aren't the Communists well on their way to control in England?

4. Won't a war here weaken us enough for the Communists to gain control, especially by a "pact" with the bundists?

5. Isn't peacetime conscription the first step? Sealing the death of democracy?

New York City —J.H.

And Then What?

—Cartoonist Thomas in the Detroit News

Movie Monopoly

TO THE EDITOR:

When the mystery surrounding the Government anti-trust suit, brought against the motion picture industry is revealed, it should prove most interesting.

Motion pictures are monopoly controlled in production, distribution and exhibition. This industry is one of the most important means of direct communication in America for propaganda purposes and moulds public opinion. American motion pictures are controlled by four men originally from Russia, Nick Schenck, his brother, Joe Schenck, Harry Warner, Louis Mayer and their relatives.

When Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold first presented the Government case to the Supreme Court of the United States, this industry was classified the most un-American business in America. The Joy Boys of Hollywood resent any interference with their monopoly of motion pictures and will fight to their stockholders' last dollar.

This month (October) Judge Henry W. Goddard of the Second Judicial Circuit of the U.S. Supreme Court, a Republican appointee, will receive a consent decree, worked out by the attorneys for the motion picture business. If this decree is accepted it will perpetuate and legally endorse the same monopoly of quality picture production, distribution and exhibition that has been in operation for years—a system which slowly strangled independent theater owners to death, kills new picture production and enforces questionable hates, passions, morals and sex culture on our youth of America.

Los Angeles, Calif. —R.M.

Feed Starving Europe

TO THE EDITOR:

A few months ago, Lord Beaverbrook announced in the British press that the "interests" of the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia were the same. Apparently he would like to have the Stars and Stripes, the Union Jack, and the Hammer and Sickle become buddies in war.

I believe it is time that American Christians arouse themselves and insist upon sending food supplies to Europe before their ancestors are forced by starvation to accept the philosophy of Josef Stalin.

When the mind is directed by the feelings of an empty stomach, one is not interested in the teachings of Christianity or patriotism.

It is important that the people of Europe be protected from hunger, regardless of whether Great Britain likes it or not.

Are the people of Europe to suffer this Winter from hunger because they have no gold to buy our farm products?

Washington is buying up the world's gold at $35 an ounce. If we have to share it with them, in order to sell our farm and factory products, it is an injustice against the American people who paid $15 an ounce for it; more than the world market price of $20.67.

Keep America for the Americans and save Europe from hunger should be the slogan of all Christians.

So. Hadley, Mass. —P.J.G.

DON'T ENTER CONTEST NOW!

WAIT UNTIL ALL 50 QUESTIONS APPEAR—BUT GET YOUR CONSTITUTION NOW

QUESTIONS FOR THIS WEEK

Question No. 13

Name One President of the United States Who Was a Tailor by Trade.

1. Martin VanBuren.
2. Millard Fillmore.
3. James Buchanan.
4. John Tyler.
5. Andrew Johnson.
6. James A. Garfield.

Question No. 14

By What Legislation Has President F. D. Roosevelt Been Empowered to Issue "Greenbacks"?

1. Thomas Amendment to Agricultural Adjustment Act, 1933.
2. Gold Devaluation Act, 1934.
3. Dies Silver Purchase Act, 1934.
4. Glass-Stegall Act, 1932.
5. Gold Clause Act, 1935.
6. Banking Act, 1933.

Fill in This Coupon and Mail With 10 Cents in Coin

Make your selection by number from suggestions under each question.

Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 13 For Question No. 13 I Select Answer No. ☐ **No. 14** For Question No. 14 I Select Answer No. ☐

Name _____

Address _____

Town or City _____ *State* _____

EXTRA COUPON FOR SELF OR FRIEND

Fill in This Coupon and Mail With 10 Cents in Coin

Make your selection by number from suggestions under each question.

Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 13 For Question No. 13 I Select Answer No. ☐ **No. 14** For Question No. 14 I Select Answer No. ☐

Name _____

Address _____

Town or City _____ *State* _____

Rules of the Contest

1. The *"AMERICA FIRST" Contest* is open to all readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine, except employes or members of their families.

2. The contest shall consist of 50 questions on the history of the United States and the *Constitution* of the United States and shall run for 11 consecutive weeks beginning the week of October 7. Two questions each week for 10 weeks and all 50 questions on the 11th week.

3. A Grand Prize of $1,500.00 will be awarded the contestant returning the best or most appropriate answers to the 50 questions and otherwise complying with the rules. Contestants submitting the next most nearly correct answers and otherwise complying with the rules shall be eligible for the additional prizes in the order of their correctness.

4. In order to qualify as a prize-winner, the contestant is required to send in 10 cents in coin (not stamps) with each pair of answers, or a total of $2.50 with the 50 answers. For these remittances the contestant will be sent without further cost a handsomely illuminated copy of the *Constitution* suitable for wall decoration.

5. We cannot take into account solutions without signed names and addresses. Neither can claims to their ownership be recognized. We cannot be responsible for coupons arriving unduly late or lost in the mails. By entering the contest the contestant agrees to accept as final the decisions of the judges as to procedure and final outcome.

6. In event of ties, additional questions will be submitted. In event of final ties, after two such submissions, duplicate prizes will be awarded.

7. Do not decorate coupons. Neatness will not count.

8. Any inquiry, the reply to which could not affect outcome of the contest, will be acknowledged.

9. A contestant may send in any number of sets of duly qualified answers and each set will be judged as a unit, but no individual may win more than one prize. If submitting more than one set of answers, the contestant is required to keep them distinct by designating them "Set 1," "Set 2," "Set 3," etc. Each submitted set shall entitle the contestant to the illuminated copy of the *Constitution* referred to in Rule 4.

ADDRESS ALL CONTEST MAIL TO:

'CONTEST MANAGER'—SOCIAL JUSTICE

ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN

Have you yet entered our great "AMERICA FIRST" Contest?

If you have not — DON'T ENTER RIGHT NOW!

Perhaps you think it's funny for us to tell you that, but we mean it.

DON'T ENTER NOW!

You see, under the rules, all 50 Contest questions will be published in the 11th week of the Contest. That will be in our issue of December 16.

From now until December 16 we will print each week two questions for those who have already entered . . . so they can keep their sets up to date.

But, if you have not entered, DON'T DO IT UNTIL DECEMBER 16.

But here's what you MUST do in order to win the Grand Prize of $1,500.00 or any of the other 259 prizes in this great contest:

YOU MUST KNOW YOUR *CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES!*

Remember, the last 30 questions of the Contest will be based upon the *Constitution.*

Have you ever read the *Constitution?* Do you KNOW it? Whether or not you have read the great document before, IT'S TIME YOU READ AND STUDIED IT AGAIN.

So, we are going to do something we never did before. We are going to send you a beautifully illuminated copy of the *Constitution,* suitable for wall decoration, EVEN BEFORE YOU START ANSWERING THE CONTEST QUESTIONS.

We will send you this beautiful copy of the *Constitution* right today — upon your saying you intend to enter the Contest when all 50 questions appear.

We shall send you at the same time all past history questions which have appeared since the Contest started. You can also be studying on these.

All you have to do to get this and START TO WORK AT STUDYING is to clip and mail the Coupon at the bottom of this page. Read that Coupon right now. See what it says.

Then mail it. Within a few days your copy of the *Constitution* will be at your door — and you can begin to learn all about it.

Of course, perhaps you have a copy of the *Constitution* in your home. There's a copy in almost every school history. If so, you will not need our wall copy right now. As a contestant, you will receive one anyway.

But, if you have not a copy of the *Constitution* in your home, use the Coupon below at once. All we ask you to do in return is to agree to become a contestant when all 50 questions appear on December 16.

Fair enough, isn't it?

TO THOSE ALREADY IN

Instructions on this page do NOT pertain to those of our readers who are already entered in the "AMERICA FIRST" Contest.

If you have already entered, be sure to keep sending in your weekly answers and remittances. By the time all 50 questions appear you will have remitted a minimum of $1.00 (covering the first 20 questions). Then you will send in your answers to the 30 questions on the Constitution with a remittance of $1.50 and you are fully qualified to be computed for the cash prizes.

260 Cash Prizes for 260 Readers

GRAND PRIZE	**$1,500.00**
Second Prize	**800.00**
Third Prize	**500.00**
Fourth Prize	**300.00**
Fifth Prize	**200.00**
Sixth Prize	**100.00**
Seventh Prize, four cash awards of $25 each	**100.00**
Fifty prizes of $10.00 each	**500.00**
Two hundred prizes of $5.00 each	**1,000.00**
TOTAL	**$5,000.00**

THIS WILL BRING YOU WHAT YOU WANT

CONTEST MANAGER, SOCIAL JUSTICE,
ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN.

I intend to enter your "AMERICA FIRST" Contest when all 50 Contest questions appear, on December 16. Between now and then I wish to study the Constitution of the United States.

Please send me, without obligation on my part, the illuminated wall copy of the Constitution which all qualified contestants are to receive. I want to study it in preparation for the questions. Also please send me all past history questions which have appeared.

My Name Is _____

My Address Is _____

City or Town _____ *State* _____

Film Stars Took Sides in Campaign

(Continued from Page 12)

Arthur Lake	Jessie Ralph
Rod LaRocque	Gene Raymond
Ivan Lebedeff	Wallace Reid, Jr,
Louis L. Lighton	Irene Rich
Harold Lloyd	Clete Roberts
Gene Lockhart	Buddy Rogers
Edmund Lowe	May Robson
Richard Macauley	Angelo Ross
Burr MacIntosh	Morrie Ryskind
Fred MacMurray	Adela Rogers St. John
Leo McCarey	Thornton Sargent
Joel McCrea	Randolph Scott
Hattie McDaniell	Ann Sheridan
James K. McGuinness	Robert Sinclair
James J. Marjorell	Joseph Sistrom
Zeppo Marx	Pete Smith
Adolphe Menjou	Ann Sothern
Una Merkel	Rosalie Stewart
Ray Milland	Lewis Stone
Hal Mohr	Dorothy Stone
Donald Montgomery	Fred Stone
Elizabeth A. Montgomery	Paula Stone
Robert Montgomery	Herbert Stothart
Ruth J. Montgomery	Preston Sturgess
Colleen Moore	Richard Thorpe
Antonio Moreno	Mrs. Spencer Tracy
Dennis Morgan	Lee Tracy
Frank Morgan	Ernest Truex
Ralph Morgan	Patricia Van Cleve
George Murphy	Evelyn Venable
Conrad Nagel	King Vidor
Florence Nash	Frank Vincent
Edna May Oliver	Raymond Walburn
Gale Page	Ruth Waterbury
Franklyn Pangborn	Charles West
Gail Patrick	Nydia Westman
Mary Pickford	Lois Wilson
Zasu Pitts	Meridith Wilson
Dick Powell	Rube Wolf
William Powell	Nat Wolf
Roger Pryor	Sam Wood
Wallace Rairden	Eugene Zukor

Thus was Hollywood split asunder.

Bosom friends found themselves on opposite sides: Pat O'Brien for Roosevelt; Bing Crosby for Willkie.

At least one family split was observed — Humphrey Bogart for Roosevelt and Mrs. Humphrey Bogart for Willkie.

It is to be hoped the campaign cleavage will not tempt Democratic film heroes to sabotage efforts to rescue a Republican heroine before some Socialist villain forecloses on the mortgage — or vice versa.

Writer in England Attends Actors' Church

UNDER the caption of "A *Variety* Mugg Goes to Church," Mr. Joshua Lowe, correspondent for *Variety* theatrical journal in Blackpool, England, writes the following "review of the bill" in an English church service.

For all its flippant irreverence, it bespeaks rather eloquently the English spirit of defiance in the face of the *blitzkrieg*. In fact — like Mr. Bernard Shaw — the writer *ignores* the war.

" 'Come to church this morning' was the opening remark made by Bud Flanagan when spotting this *Variety* mugg recently," the correspondent relates.

" 'You mean synagogue, Bud,' said the mug.

" 'No — church,' emphasized Bud.

"On the principle of trying anything once, we went to church.

"St. Stephen's-on-the-Cliff, which is to British showfolk what New York's Little Church Around the Corner is to the Yankees, is operated by Canon Freshwater, who is a ringer for the late Fred Kitchen, but prefers to be likened to the late Sir Gerald Du Maurier, whom he also resembles.

"This bill had real star material, competing with any attraction in town. (Since Blackpool has now superseded London as the show spot, that's saying something). About those in evidence, besides Flanagan, there were Douglas Wakefield, Dave Morris, Fred Walmsley, Doodles, the local circus clown, an institution in this burg; Tessie O'Shea, Joe Davis, Harry Korris, Morton and Kaye, Jack Hylton's father, Iris Sadler, the John Tiller Girls and Tony Eaton, female impersonator, in the church choir. Hylton, always in next-to-closing spot, came late from force of habit. Letter regretting absence, but stating he was with them in spirit, came from secretary of Variety Artists' Federation. (This might have hinted to some of the performers to come through with their VAF dues.)

MUSIC BY BILLY COTTON BAND

"Music was provided by Billy Cotton and his band, who discarded the usual publishers' plugs on this auspicious occasion for Rimsky-Korsakoff's *'Hindu Chanson'* and *'Hymn to the Sun'* with no bows or encores, which was tough on John Abbott, Francis, Day & Hunter's general manager, who almost shouted. 'Bill, give us the *'Woodpecker Song.'*

"Most coveted job, that of passing the offertory plate, was handled by Wakefield, Bud Flanagan, Dave Morris and this mugg, latter three with the most kosher pusses ever seen in this place of worship. Majority of showfolk were of the opinion Joe Davis should have been roped in on to the offertory plate idea, for, as billiard champ, his was the steadiest hand there.

"There is sprightliness, brightness and showmanship here, which is lacking in most churches. It even boasts a spotlight.

DOTTED WITH STAGE NAMES

"Place is dotted with famous stage names, with massive window dedicated to John Huddlestone and John Tiller, founders of Blackpool's famous Winter Garden. It also sports a marble floor in memory of Mrs. John Tiller, who died in 1936, erected out of contributions received from Tiller gals all over the world.

"Most important is altar dedicated to the Theatrical Profession, with marble panels containing names of over 700 world prominent stars who contributed to the building of this church, which cost nearly $250,000. Among the names are Sophie Tucker, Elsie Janis, Sybil Thorndyke, Fred Terry, Marie Tempest, George Arliss, Will Fyffe, George Robey, Noel Coward, C. B. Cochran, Bud Flanagan, Ivor Novello, Gracie Fields, George Formby, Georgie Wood, Gladys Cooper, Leslie Henson, Ella Shields, Fred Duprez, Cicely Courtneidge and Sydney Howard. Jimmy 'Schnozzola' Durante's name is merely penciled in, awaiting the arrival of his check."

Oil Is 'Dynamite'

IN THIS WAR the oil barons have allied themselves with the munitions magnates and steel tycoons as merchandisers of mass murder and dealers in death.

In Pennsylvania, Jay Cooke, Republican nominee for the United States Senate, stated that he "could prove that Hitler had been started on his conquest of Europe with the help of Mexican oil," obtained through the activity of U. S. officialdom.

The campaign speaker threatened that if he were elected, he would institute a Senate inquiry into all the Washington connections with Mexico's expropriation of American and British oil properties and the barter sale to Germany, in the 18 months preceding the war, of more than 10-million barrels of oil.

Mr. Cooke threatened that he would *"press the inquiry to wherever it may reach."*

According to the official Mexican reports of exports, nearly the same amount of oil was sold to Italy, Germany's axis partner, while 1,023,341 barrels went to Japan.

Thus, the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis received more than 21-million barrels of oil from British and American oil properties confiscated by a Communist regime, which has been coddled and subsidized and protected by influential New Dealers at Washington.

Shortly before Hitler invaded Poland, Americans discovered that Mexico was shipping expropriated oil to Germany and Italy.

At that time Senator Styles Bridges demanded an inquiry into the situation; but his request for an inquiry was buried in the oblivion of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mexico, in exchange, received thousands of tons of German steel which canny Mexicans had the effrontery to try to sell to America at prices below the cost of production for American steel.

Thus, we see how America subsidized the Cardenas government through the premium buying of silver, Cardenas confiscated American oil properties and sold the oil to Germany; Germany gave in exchange steel, and Cardenas tries to sell the steel to Americans . . . and, saps that we are, they all but get away with it!

Thus, Americans *pay three ways to enrich everyone but ourselves in these international transactions.*

* * *

The Mexican oil was, reportedly, sold to Germany through the offices and efforts of William Rhodes Davis, New York broker, whose operations constitute a stranger than fiction career.

Senator Guffey of Pennsylvania, New York brain truster and Mr. Cooke's opponent in the Senatorial campaign, testified under oath that in 1937 — before the Mexican government confiscated the oil properties of British and American concerns — that he had visited Mexico City with Mr. Davis and Walter A. Jones, Pittsburgh business man who was identified as being in the employ of Mr. Davis.

In a deposition Senator Guffey said that when he paid a call to President Cardenas he had "discussed the business" on which Messrs. Davis and Jones had gone to Mexico City.

Six months later, the confiscation and expropriation took place by the executive order of President Cardenas and Mr. Davis was given the Mexican contract to act as sales agent and broker for the oil taken from the seized properties.

In Mr. Davis' New York office he displays prominently a photograph of President Roosevelt with the inscription and autograph: "To my friend Major Davis — Franklin D. Roosevelt."

Mr. Davis, furthermore, is one of the 35 underwriters of the Hyde Park Library, which is to preserve the official Roosevelt papers for posterity.

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

National Unity

A VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION to the philosophy of national unity was made by Archbishop McNichols of Cincinnati, Ohio, in a recent address before an audience of 80,000 persons at Crosley Field.

He outlined a five-point program for national unity as follows: (1) Love of God; (2) Love of neighbor; (3) Strengthening of the American home; (4) Bringing religion into education; and (5) Bringing home to every citizen the duty of upholding every legitimate authority.

Love of God, said the Archbishop, is essential if human life is to have its essential valuation.

Love of neighbor, he went on, is an essential human characteristic as well as a divine command. "It is nothing less than insanity and inhumanity to provoke hatred of the Jewish race. They are our brothers in God. Likewise, it is insane and inhuman too to oppose organized religion and to teach the hatred of those who realize that the Omnipotent God ordained worship through an organized force in the world."

"Strengthen the American home. They are being 'bombed by divorce, by birth control, by sterilization, in increasing numbers, year by year,' said the Archbishop. "The very atmosphere of the home is frequently irreligious or indifferent to religion. There can be no real national unity, without religious homes that inculcate love of God and love of neighbor. Unless the moral fibre of our citizens is renewed there will be no physical stamina for the citizens of our country.

"Atheists are given more consideration in the schools of our country than are those who insist on explaining religious principles and fitting our youth for life by religious training and discipline. I do not presume to say how the religious groups of this country should bring back religion into the schools, but I do say that it can and should be done. And I do say further that those who oppose religious education, whether they realize it or not, will, if they succeed, be the destroyers of America

"We are gradually becoming a nation less respectful of parental authority, less respectful of civil authority, and less respectful to the officials of the Church," he concluded. "This undermining of authority is, at the same time, destroying the very structure of our country, for it is a direct attack on God, since all authority is from God."

* * *

The National Union for Social Justice was established by Father Coughlin in 1935.

The Radio Priest pioneered, under the New Deal, in insisting upon the idea of a national unity.

We recollect how strenuously he insisted upon class co-operation and fought class exploitation.

We recollect how he insisted upon a spiritual basis without which national unity could not be achieved.

And we recollect—as Father Coughlin openly admits—that the National Union for Social Justice bogged down because it became entangled in the weeds of politics.

The idea was sound as conceived by Father Coughlin.

The execution of the idea was weak because incompetent men made of it a political football.

In future editions the ideas broadcast by Father Coughlin relative to national union will find re-expression in these pages.

At the moment, however, may we predict that national unity will not be realized in America unless atheism is driven from our schools and colleges; unless Christian morals are established as the basic principles upon which the relations between labor, agriculture, industry, finance, are conducted.

The war which now engages our attention—a war which promises to engulf the entire world including the United States—is the logical result of unChristian policies, unChristian economies, unChristian governments and unChristian peace treaties.

And the termination of this war—a termination brought about by sheer exhaustion—will not be identified with lasting peace unless Christianity will be accepted without compromise by the belligerents.

National unity then without Christ is unthinkable.

A LETTER TO FATHER COUGHLIN

Organizations—the National Union—Unity

(See Page 8)